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This memo provides an overview of public participation in the San Francisco Housing Element 2022 Update (2022 Update) and a high-level summary of the public input received. The three attached public input summary reports detail the input from those efforts and describe how the policies were shaped by the engagement. As demonstrated in these reports, SF Planning has engaged in substantial discussions on housing concerns, goals, and actions with constituents that are representative of diverse income levels, age, special needs, housing situations, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender identity, immigration status, household type, and neighborhoods.

The engagement process for the 2022 Update incorporates three phases of outreach and engagement. After vetting key ideas with the community in Phase I, the project team reviewed draft housing policy and related actions with residents, community and government leaders, and housing experts and advocates in Phase II. During Phase III of outreach and engagement, the project team demonstrated how community input was reflected in revised policy and further refined critical ideas such as the reparative framework for housing.

      May- Dec 2020    Phase I outreach – Vetting Key Ideas with the Community
      Apr- Sep 2021    Phase II outreach – Refining Policies Together
      Jan- Mar 2022    Phase III outreach – Refining Policies & Verifying Public Input Findings

Outreach moving forward will focus on sharing information about the draft 2022 Update content and adoption process and facilitating discussions with community and government leaders to prepare for its implementation. Methods of outreach have included:

- 23 focus groups with vulnerable populations co-hosted or co-facilitated by community-based organizations
- 65+ community hosted community conversations, listening sessions, and presentations
- 11 in-language events in Cantonese and Spanish
- 21 community partners
• 2 Housing Policy Group discussion series (12 meetings total), including representatives of 27 organizations
• 4 Planning Commission and 2 Historic Preservation Commission hearings
• 226 respondents through the Digital Participation Platform (DPP), along with informational tools such as policy navigation tools
• 11 Community ambassadors (HEARD)
• A survey administered online and in person, completed by 1,631 respondents

Figure: Outreach and Engagement Map and List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission*</td>
<td>Latino Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAP 2020</td>
<td>Latino Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMA Planning 101</td>
<td>SF Youth Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MOHCD Working Group*</td>
<td>Larkin Street Youth Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
<td>Senior &amp; Disability Action*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>District 10 CBO</td>
<td>MegaBlack*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>St. Francis CAC</td>
<td>Mo'MAGIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>District 1 Townhall</td>
<td>Tenderloin People's Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Richmond Community Coalition</td>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SPUR Digital Discourse</td>
<td>HRC Roundtable*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Housing Element Overview*</td>
<td>HRC Roundtable*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>District 4 Virtual</td>
<td>OMI Community Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Bayview-Hunter's Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sunset Forward</td>
<td>Planning Association for the Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sunset Forward</td>
<td>North Beach Neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sunset Forward</td>
<td>Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SF YIMBY*</td>
<td>Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MOHCD*</td>
<td>Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tenderloin Housing Clinic La Voz Latina</td>
<td>Cayuga Neighborhood Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
<td>Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>English Listening Session*</td>
<td>SF League of Conservation Voters*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>District 7*</td>
<td>SF YIMBY*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>Open Door Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Spanish Listening Session*</td>
<td>SPUR*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Richmond Senior Center*</td>
<td>Building Trade Public Policy Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chinese Listening Session*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Spanish Listening Session*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fillmore/Western Addition</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>HEARD*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>HEARD*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*groups that reach a multi-neighborhood or citywide audience
Demographic Reach
The Housing Element 2022 Update process reached a range of populations through the multiple methods of outreach. Participants of the Digital Participation Platform (DPP), utilized in Phase I and II, skewed toward people who are male-identifying, high income, white, and between the ages of 18 and 39. This is likely due to the skill and knowledge required to navigate the online platform and perhaps a communication preference of this group.

Recognizing the limitations of an online platform intended for people to navigate independently, the Housing Element 2022 Update also partnered with community organizations to introduce surveys, listening sessions, community conversations and meetings, and focus groups as methods of centering participants from vulnerable populations. Respondents to the survey administered in Phase I were more evenly distributed among Black/African American, East Asian, and Latino(a,e) communities, with 18 to 21 percent each. More than 52 percent of respondents were above 40 years old, and most respondents lived in very low to moderate-income households.

Beyond the DPP and survey, a total of 94 listening sessions, community conversations and meetings, and focus groups were held from Phase I to Phase III. More than half (64, or 71 percent) of these outreach and engagement events prioritized the voices of vulnerable populations, including Black communities, American Indian communities, other communities of color, limited English speakers, seniors and people with disabilities, and transitional aged youth. Of these events, the most specific participant-level demographic data came from Phase II focus groups. Focus group demographics skewed toward people who are female-identifying, very low to low income, Black, Hispanic/Latino(a/e), communities of color, and renters.

Phase II focus groups engaged vulnerable and historically harmed communities, while Phase III prioritized vulnerable groups and individuals that were not as well represented in Phase I and II and those with particular interest in policy areas requiring refinement, such as the reparative framework and increasing housing capacity in well-resourced neighborhoods.

Summary of Input
The breadth of input received defies a simple synthesis of themes and direction. The following summary is organized by the key demographic groups whose input this effort attempted to elevate to center the Housing Element 2022 Update around equity. These groups are identified to be most vulnerable to housing instability for a variety of reasons, including income, health, education, and linguistic isolation. Many groups shared overlapping themes, such as homeownership, safe spaces, access to key services, and access to affordable housing across San Francisco. The highlights below are some top themes and ideas specific to each group and should only be taken as a short representation of feedback provided by key demographic groups. An in-depth look at the breadth of experiences and ideas shared by all participants during the Housing Element 2022 Update process can be found in the reports for Phases I through III outreach and engagement as well as descriptions of how input was incorporated into the draft plan.

American Indian Residents and Community Leaders
American Indian community members shared input around themes of visibility, restitution, and support for the preservation of their culture. Directives for policies and programs particularly relevant to the needs of the American Indian community included restoring access to land for traditional cultural uses and to invest in spaces for the American Indian community, fixing the undercounting and improve data on housing needs of American Indians, and restitution in the form of housing and support for homelessness services universally prioritizing
American Indians.

**Black and African American Residents and Community Leaders**
Emerging themes from Black and African American communities responded to past and current targeted harmful actions of government institutions, leading to segregation, disinvestment, trauma, and displacement of San Francisco's Black and African American communities. Participants voiced a need to close the wealth gap, create intergenerational wealth, remove barriers to housing programs, and increasing access to housing. Key ideas for policies and programs to address needs of Black and African American communities include expansion of the Certificate of Preference program, creating and expanding legacy homeownership and business programs, and prioritizing the Black community to own and rent in all neighborhoods of San Francisco, especially in their historic neighborhoods.

**Japanese American and Filipino Residents and Community Leaders**
Similar to input from American Indian and Black and African American communities, recurring themes from the Japanese American and Filipino communities centered around repairing past government-led harms of incarceration and redevelopment. Ideas for policies and programs shared in public input include offering Certificates of Preference to Japanese American and Filipino households, increased funding toward City programs and community-based organizations to support home and business ownership, and investing in safe and welcoming cultural spaces that preserve community history.

**Latino (a/e) Residents and Community Leaders**
Community members from various Latino (a/e) groups around the city shared themes and experiences less common among other key demographics particularly from barriers to housing access due to documentation status, linguistic isolation, economic inequality, and family size. This not only impacts the ability to access housing, but also to remain stable in housing. Ideas for policies and programs to address these barriers include investing in community-based organization resource hubs to focus on cultural humility and navigation of systems, supporting services particularly in the Mission neighborhood where Latino (a/e) families feel more welcome compared to some other parts of the city, and building more permanently affordable housing for larger families.

**Chinese Residents and Community Leaders**
The outreach and engagement process reached Chinese community members across San Francisco's Priority Equity Geographies and Well-Resourced Neighborhoods. Bearing in mind that input may vary based on these geographies, emerging themes from these conversations generally centered around language barriers and difficulty navigating the City's housing systems, qualifying and being chosen for affordable housing, and promoting diverse communities. Policies and programs specific to the city's Chinese communities include support for expanding Chinese-language outreach and services beyond Chinatown, increasing housing opportunities by building denser housing for all income ranges and household sizes on the west side of the city, and programming cross-cultural events.

**Seniors and People with Disabilities and their Service Providers**
Housing needs of seniors and people with disabilities focused on the shortage of housing, especially affordable housing, for this particular group throughout the city. Special considerations for seniors and people with disabilities include a desire to downsize homes in their neighborhoods, immediate access to amenities and services, and homes designed for specific physical needs. Community members shared that policies and
programs to meet the needs of seniors and people with disabilities could include ease and support for housing programs like ADUs that would allow seniors to age in place across San Francisco, creating a disabled operating subsidy program for disabled people regardless of age, and designing buildings and homes with accessible amenities, on-site health and social services, and meals.

**LGBTQ+ Residents and Community Leaders**

Mental health providers working with LGBTQ+ youth and members of the LGBTQ+ community shared some of their own unique housing challenges: lack of access to housing beyond environments of physical and mental abuse, feeling unwelcome in housing not specific to their community, and lack of housing in areas where LGBTQ+ do feel welcome, like the Castro. Housing for the LGBTQ+ community must also consider the specific needs that may vary from youth to seniors, small to large households, and state of mental health, among other factors. Policies and programs that community members shared include increasing on-site and mobile case managers and navigation services, increasing LGBTQ+ and youth-centered permanently affordable housing in environments away from abuse, and greater density and height in the Castro to allow for community density required to sustain community ties and culture.
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I. Introduction

The Housing Element 2022 Update is San Francisco’s housing plan for the next 8 years (2023-2030) and the first that will center on racial and social equity. It will include policies and programs that express our collective vision and values for the future of housing in San Francisco. This update will determine what our housing needs are and how we will work to address them, defining priorities for decision making and resource allocation for housing programs, development, and services.

The last Housing Element update was completed in 2014 with a streamlined effort largely based on policies and values dating back to 1990.

The next update to the Housing Element relies on an extensive and robust outreach and engagement effort to ensure our housing plan reflects current housing needs, priorities, and values of our communities, particularly of our communities of color and other vulnerable communities. Within the last decade San Francisco has gone through an economic boom and affordability crisis, and has been impacted by a global public health crisis and economic downturn, as well as a national racial reckoning, all of which has played a part in shaping the outreach and engagement process for the city’s next housing plan.
I.1 Housing Element 2022 Update: Planning Process

The planning process for the Housing Element 2022 Update started with learning from past efforts prior to embarking on three phases of outreach and engagement. This report summarizes what the Planning Department has accomplished during the learning step, followed by a comprehensive summary of the first phase of outreach and engagement including tools used, communities engaged, level of participation, and input heard.

Table 1. Housing Element 2022 Update Planning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Vetting Key Ideas with the Community</th>
<th>May 2020 - March 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning from Past Efforts</td>
<td>Gather and summarize key policy ideas from past efforts related to housing and community development</td>
<td>Public announcement through an informational public hearing, website, email, and social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Refining Policies Together</td>
<td>April 2021 - March 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask the community to reflect on the draft key policy ideas and share their housing needs, challenges, and opportunities to inform the first draft of policy updates</td>
<td>Website, video promotion, traditional media, phone, mail, social media, email blasts, presentations, listening sessions, surveys, and digital participation platform</td>
<td>First draft of policy updates based on input shared by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Moving Towards Adoption</td>
<td>April 2022 - December 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek approval of the Housing Element 2022 Update based on the third draft from elected officials and State Agency</td>
<td>Public hearings with the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Adopted update to the Housing Element in compliance with State Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Events modified for public health safety)
I.2 Principles for Outreach and Engagement

The following principles guide all outreach and engagement for the Housing Element 2022 Update process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive representation</td>
<td>Engage San Franciscans representing a range of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, age, abilities, housing type and tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful contribution</td>
<td>Ensure each step of outreach has a clear intent and outcome, including how input will be incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information and participation</td>
<td>Use a variety of online and in-person platforms for participation scheduled at times, locations, and in languages accessible to different households. In-person events will be ADA-accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent communication</td>
<td>Maintain an updated website to document information and feedback gathered and use variety of methods to notify communities about upcoming events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, the Planning Department’s goal is to hear from communities it has not actively engaged for Housing Element updates in the past and to elevate those voices, including communities of color, low-income communities, and immigrant residents, among other vulnerable or hard to reach communities.

Through each phase of outreach, the Housing Element will engage with the following groups:

**Residents and Community Members**

- **Their role**: Shape the goals, policies, and actions to ensure an equitable and affordable housing future for San Francisco.
- **Who they are**: Residents, community members, neighborhood organizations, community serving organizations, and homeowner groups.

**Resident Ambassador Group (HEARD)**

- **Their role**: Provide meaningful input, perspective, and opinions for all planning phases; encourage participation from a broad range of residents
- **Who they are**: Resident ambassadors representing a range of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic statuses, age, abilities, housing types and tenure in San Francisco.

**Housing Policy Working Groups**

- **Their role**: Provide their expertise on policies, actions and metrics for the Housing Element and support community engagement.
- **Who they are**: Technical experts, for-profit and non-profit developers, housing advocacy groups, tenant advocacy groups, homelessness service providers, and social service providers.

\[1\] In-person discussions and listening sessions have not been possible due to San Francisco’s shelter-in-place order in response to the COVID-19 pandemic
Interagency Steering Committee

- **Their role:** Collaborate in policy development to ensure the Housing Element is successful in achieving its goals and implementing its policies.

- **Who they are:** Local government agencies that provide housing and/or housing services.

Civic Leaders

- **Their role:** Holding public hearings for public comment and adopting the Housing Element 2022 Update.

- **Who they are:** Human Rights Commission, Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

The following section will provide a brief overview of the preparation conducted prior to kicking off the outreach and engagement for the Housing Element 2022 Update.

### I.3 Preparation Phase: Learning from Past Efforts

Since the adoption of the 2014 Housing Element, the Planning Department pursued multiple initiatives that evaluated and analyzed housing needs and strategies that also relied on outreach and engagement. San Francisco communities shared their input through these processes. In order to maintain the continuity of community outreach and to remain true to the value of participation, the upcoming outreach and engagement laid its foundation on these recent efforts.

During the preparation phase, the Planning Department summarized this input into key policy ideas and values related. These key policy ideas were used as a starting point for discussion for Phase 1 of the Housing Element 2022 Update outreach and engagement.

This work relied heavily on community ideas shared through outreach and engagement for several projects and initiatives, among them:

- **Housing Affordability Strategies (HAS):** This initiative analyzes how the City of San Francisco can improve housing affordability over the next 30 years, particularly for low- and moderate-income households. The HAS analyzed development feasibility, City policies, and public investments needed to achieve the City’s housing targets created through both Mayoral action and the will of the voters: build 5,000 new housing units per year, at least one third of which should be permanently affordable at low and moderate incomes. In addition, the HAS analyzed programs to preserve affordable housing and to protect and stabilize residents. The purpose of the HAS is to help residents, City staff, and policy makers understand how different policies and funding strategies work together to address affordability and foster the diversity of our city. The analysis and outreach for the HAS will inform the 2022 Housing Element update.

- **Community Stabilization Initiative:** This initiative is a multi-agency effort to assess the City’s existing portfolio of tools, unify fragmented efforts into one comprehensive inventory, and identify priorities for the future. The initiative seeks to mitigate the impacts of ongoing displacement and help vulnerable populations thrive and contribute to the City’s economy and culture. It enables decision-makers to make strategic choices and support interagency coordination to help stabilize our vulnerable populations. The inventory of policies included an assessment of current tools, their potential for expansion and new policies that could be implemented to address displacement. This inventory informed the key policy ideas shared in Phase 1.

- **Connect SF:** This initiative is a multi-agency collaborative process to build an effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation system for San Francisco’s future. Connect SF will inform San Francisco’s Transportation Element and will allow for the Transportation Element and the Housing Element to be aligned to better respond to sustainability and livability issues.

- **Excelsior & Outer Mission Neighborhood Strategy:** The strategy is a vision developed by community members, City agencies, the Excelsior Action Group, and Supervisor Ahsha Safai’s office
to improve and enhance the Excelsior, Outer Mission, Mission Terrace, Crocker Amazon, and Cayuga neighborhoods. The strategy includes housing goals, strategies, and action items that informed the initial key housing policy ideas.

**Mission Action Plan 2020 (MAP2020):**
MAP2020 is a community-initiated effort that began in 2015 as a collaborative process between community advocates and City staff to identify potential solutions for the residents, arts organizations, nonprofits and businesses being displaced by the rapid changes in the Mission. Community participants include the Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA), Dolores Street Community Services/Mission SRO Collaborative, SF Tenant Unions, Cultural Action Network and long-time neighborhood activists from Plaza 16, Pacific Felt Factory, and the Calle 24 Latinx Cultural District. The solutions arrived at in this collaboration also informed the initial key housing policy ideas.

After analyzing the community guidance for these previous efforts, the Planning Department distilled guiding values\(^2\) that will be used as a framework for the Housing Element policy updates. These guiding values were noted as important for the community in the previous outreach efforts, and they were values that were not strongly present in the existing 2014 Housing Element policies. They include:

- **Racial and social equity** as a lens and goal for housing policies, programs and metrics
- **Eliminating community displacement**, particularly of communities of color and low-income communities
- **Affordable housing choices for everyone in all neighborhoods**, particularly for low-income households and vulnerable populations
- **Thriving neighborhoods resilient to climate and health crises** that provide access to opportunity

The summarized key policy ideas were organized into the following five categories and into topics within these five categories; this content was used in Phase 1 to gather input through a digital participation platform and an in-person and online survey:

1. Recognize the historic racial, ethnic, and social inequities in government programs and champion equitable housing choice to reverse their consequences.

2. Maintain **housing security** for vulnerable communities and protect them against displacement

3. **Preserve affordability** and enhance the resiliency of existing housing

4. Advance the social and economic diversity of San Francisco by increasing **housing production** including permanently affordable housing

5. Promote **sustainable, livable, and resilient neighborhoods** when developing housing

What followed the preparation phase was the beginning of an extensive community outreach and engagement process that enlisted further input from San Francisco residents and community members about the future of housing for the City. The rest of this document will report on Phase 1 of outreach and engagement for the Housing Element 2022 Update and provide a summary of all the input received.
II. Phase 1: Vetting Key Ideas with the Community

The Planning Department launched the Housing Element 2022 Update with an informational presentation at the Planning Commission on May 28, 2020. Phase 1 of the Housing Element 2022 Update outreach and engagement focused on gathering input from San Francisco residents and community members, the Housing Policy Group, and HEARD on housing needs, challenges, and opportunities. Through informational presentations, listening sessions, and the project website, The Planning Department also explored data with the community reflecting housing needs, inequities and housing production; the historical context and structural factors that led to racial and social disparities in housing and economic stability; the factors that contributed to the housing affordability crisis; and, the guiding values and summarized key policy ideas to review their adequacy in framing policy development and addressing San Francisco challenges. During this process, the Planning Department’s goal was to elevate the voices of underrepresented communities and communities that historically have not been invited into housing policy decision-making so that this largely unheard population could provide input on the summarized key policy ideas and share their experiences and perspective on housing issues. The input received during Phase 1 and summarized below informed the first draft of goals, policies, and actions and allowed Planning to evaluate whether the guiding values distilled from the preparation phase align with the values expressed by the participants.

For Phase 1, the Planning Department hired InterEthnica to assist with outreach and engagement activities. InterEthnica has extensive outreach experience in San Francisco, as well as experience in multilanguage communications and working with in-language traditional media (TV, newspapers, and radio). Additionally, InterEthnica had assisted the Department with outreach for the Housing Affordability Strategies and the Community Stabilization Initiative, so they were familiar with housing and community development issues. InterEthnica responsibilities included but were not limited to:

- Review of the Planning Department materials and content for accessibility
- Outreach to traditional media outlets to secure interviews and stories about the project
- Development of the selection criteria for the resident ambassador group (HEARD), recruitment of the members and facilitation of HEARD meetings
- Distribution of door hangers about the project in public and affordable housing in San Francisco
- Email announcements
- Translation services
- In-language presentations and facilitation, as well as interpretation
- Engagement facilitation
- Survey design and distribution
- Outreach to communities of color

In upcoming sections, this report refers to InterEthnica as “the consultant.”
II.1 Communication Tools for Enlisting Participation and Collaboration

The following methods were employed to distribute information about the Housing Element 2022 Update planning process and ways to participate in the process:

- **Website:** A dedicated Housing Element 2022 Update website was launched to keep residents and community members informed about opportunities to participate. The website shares information about the Housing Element, the planning timeline, and the outreach and engagement strategy. It also includes a digital participation platform that allows users to comment on the key policy ideas (described in the Preparation Phase section above) while learn more about San Francisco’s housing needs, inequities, production, and preservation. The website is fully translated into Spanish and Chinese, and a Google Translate option is available for Tagalog.

- **Promotional video:** A one-minute video in English, Spanish and Chinese was published on the Planning Department’s YouTube channel explaining in lay terms what the Housing Element is and why it was important to participate in the update of its policies. The video has been shared at informational presentations and listening sessions, on the Housing Element 2022 Update website, and in social media posts.

- **Four email bulletins and eblasts:** Email newsletters for the project kickoff, upcoming events, opportunities to participate online (digital participation platform and short survey), and other announcements were sent in English, Spanish and Chinese to the more than 800 email addresses registered for the Planning Department's Housing/Housing Element GovDelivery bulletins and to 445 contacts from various community-based organizations, private and affordable housing developers, neighborhood associations, advocacy groups, trade groups, and others.
- **Traditional media:** TV and radio coverage of the project was used to launch the Housing Element 2022 Update and to highlight the importance of public participation and engagement. Coverage included:

  **TV interviews with:**
  - KTVU FOX 2 in English
  - Telemundo 48 in Spanish
  - KTSF TV 26 in Chinese

  **Radio:**
  - KCBS coverage in English
  - Interview for Hecho en California in Spanish

- **Social media:** Multiple messages were posted through Facebook and Twitter to share the project’s promotional video, direct residents and community members to the website, invite people to participate online using the digital participation platform, invite people to take the survey, and inform the public about the Planning Department-hosted listening sessions. All messages were posted in English, Spanish, and Chinese.

- **Door Hangers:** Door hangers with project information were printed in English on one side and Spanish or Chinese on the other. The consultant distributed the door hangers in public housing and affordable housing sites, particularly in the Fillmore/Western Addition area.

- **Elected Officials and Newsletters:** Informational presentations were made to most district Supervisors and/or their aides on the Housing Element 2022 Update planning process. The Planning Department also shared outreach materials with Supervisors’ aides to be published in their newsletters and requested space for informational presentations for the public during Supervisors’ standing community meetings. Some Supervisors hosted special townhalls for input gathering the Housing Element 2022 Update (see next section).
• **Informational Presentations at Community and Neighborhood Meetings:** Some community-based organizations (CBOs) graciously agreed to host the Planning Department for informational presentations and listening sessions with their constituents. In total, staff attended 9 meetings held by CBOs and Supervisors to share information about the project and ways to participate in the process (see Table 2).

• **CBO Newsletters:** Planning shared outreach materials with CBOs belonging to the Housing Policy Group and those hosting the informational presentations to be shared with the public in their newsletters.

• **Posters:** The consultant printed posters in English, Spanish and Chinese enlisting participation for the project survey and distributed them around the City.

---

**Table 2. List of Informational Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/28/2020</td>
<td>1pm-3pm</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>Housing Element 2022 Update Launch at the Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2020</td>
<td>11am-12:30pm</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>Map 2020 June Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2020</td>
<td>3pm-4:30pm</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>SOMA Planning 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7/2020</td>
<td>3pm-4:30pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>MOHCD Eviction Prevention &amp; Tenant Empowerment Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/2020</td>
<td>1pm-2pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>BMAGIC Monthly Convener Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2020</td>
<td>11am-12pm</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>D10 CBO Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2020</td>
<td>3pm-4pm</td>
<td>Conference Line</td>
<td>St Francis Memorial Board of Trustees’ CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2020</td>
<td>1pm-2pm</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>D1 Town Hall Debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2020</td>
<td>10am-11am</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>Richmond Community Coalition Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2020</td>
<td>12:30pm-1:30pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>SPUR Digital Discourse: Housing Elements 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2020</td>
<td>2pm-2:30pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Housing Element Overview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.2 Outreach and Engagement for SF Residents and Community Members

Phase I outreach and engagement had to adjust to comply with San Francisco’s shelter-in-place order in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Planning implemented three primary outreach and engagement methods to reach residents and community members during this phase of the Housing Element 2022 Update: listening sessions, the digital participation platform, and a survey. The Planning Department also gathered input through the messages received from the Contact Us form on the website and through direct written input in the form of emails or attached documents. Comments gathered through all of these methods are summarized later in this report.

**Listening Sessions**

Listening sessions were promoted through GovDelivery bulletins, email announcements, Housing Policy Group meetings, informational meetings, and social media. Listening sessions usually lasted an hour to an hour and a half. They started with a 10 to 15 minute presentation about the importance of the Housing Element, the planning process for the 2022 Update, the guiding principles for this update, housing data related to the geography or community engaged, relevant key policy ideas, and prompts for small group discussions. The rest of the time during these sessions was spent gathering input from San Francisco residents and community members on their housing needs, challenges, and opportunities. The Planning Department’s task during these meeting was simply to listen respectfully, capture all the input shared, ask clarifying questions, and facilitate participation.

Two of the events were hosted by Supervisors (District 1 and District 4). Two more were hosted by City agencies, including the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development and the Human Rights Commission, using their existing meetings with community-based organizations. Four events were held in partnership with community-based organizations that graciously offered to host the Planning Department and facilitate conversations with their communities. Five events were hosted by the Planning Department alone with support from the consultant. In addition to the listening sessions, project staff also joined five community meetings in the Sunset and in the District 7 where the community provided feedback on a variety of topics (including housing) as part of their community planning effort. Their responses are also incorporated into the input summary shared in this report. The table below shows all the listening sessions and community meetings facilitated by or presented at by the Planning Department staff during Phase 1 of outreach and engagement.
### Table 3. List of Listening Sessions and Community Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th># Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/25/2020</td>
<td>10am-11:30am</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>D4 Virtual Town Hall on Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2020</td>
<td>10am-11:30am</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>D1 Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/2020</td>
<td>6pm-8pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Sunset Forward: D4 Housing Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/2020</td>
<td>6pm-8pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Sunset Forward: D4 Housing Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2020</td>
<td>2pm-3:30pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Sunset Forward: D4 Housing Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2020</td>
<td>6:30pm-8pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>YIMBY Listening Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2020</td>
<td>1pm-2:30pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>MOHCD Eviction Prevention &amp; Tenant Empowerment Working Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2020</td>
<td>5pm-6pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>THC’s La Voz Latina Listening Session</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2020</td>
<td>12pm-1pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>BMAGIC Listening Session</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2020</td>
<td>10am-11:30am</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>English Listening Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2020</td>
<td>12pm-1:30pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>D7 Community Meeting #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2020</td>
<td>11am-12pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>HRC’s Community Roundtable Listening Session</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2020</td>
<td>6pm-7:30pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Spanish Listening Session</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2020</td>
<td>1pm-2pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Richmond Senior Center Listening Session in Chinese</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2020</td>
<td>9am-10:30am</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Chinese Listening Session</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2020</td>
<td>11am-12:30pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Spanish Listening Session</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/2020</td>
<td>6:30pm-8pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Fillmore/ Western Addition Listening Session</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2020</td>
<td>4pm-5:30pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>D7 Community Meeting #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. HEARD Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/18/2020</td>
<td>6pm-8pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>HEARD Meeting 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22/2020</td>
<td>10am-12pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>HEARD Meeting 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEARD Coordination

The intention of HEARD was to create a group of San Francisco residents representing a range of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, age, ability, housing types, and tenure in San Francisco that is dedicated to providing input on top housing concerns in the City and encouraging participation from fellow community members who are often overlooked in the conversation on housing. The Planning Department invited all members of the public to fill out a short application and serve as a voice for their communities; the application was promoted through GovDelivery bulletins, email announcements, Housing Policy Group meetings, informational meetings, one-on-one conversations with community-based organizations and social media. Fifty-three (53) people applied, and eleven residents were selected to take part in HEARD based on their ability to serve as community ambassadors. Resident ambassadors were compensated for their participation in Phase 1 of outreach and engagement. Selection criteria included:

- A diversity of race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, geography, age, abilities, housing types, and length of residence to ensure that HEARD elevated the voice of communities that had been historically underrepresented

- Commitment to attending all three meetings; if a member did not have access to virtual meeting, then they needed to commit to participating via phone

- Connections to a wide network of the communities HEARD aimed to reach and elevate their voice, to share project-related information, and motivate their participation

- Capacity and ability to utilize interactive tools and methods including but not limited to phone calls, email, social media, community organizing, and encouraging participation, either virtually or at in-person meetings and events (when appropriate).

- Not currently involved with or limited previous involvement in housing-related policy discussions with the City, neighborhoods, or advocacy groups.

The consultant was tasked with recruiting and coordinating the HEARD participants; these tasks included meeting with the group to share responsibilities and to gather input for the Housing Element 2022 Update (see table below). HEARD members were crucial in identifying that the digital participation platform was inaccessible to a lot of people due to the extensive and technical nature of the content and the fact that many people do not have access to the internet. HEARD members supported the creation of a simplified survey to be administered online and in person and to be promoted with in-language printed posters. HEARD members actively participated in posting posters around their neighborhoods and promoting and administering the survey (you can see their contribution in the “Survey” section below), with some dedicating more effort to these tasks. While this input and support was important, the Planning Department fell short of achieving its goals for HEARD because of insufficient coordination and a failure to fully activate the group’s skills and resources. The Planning Department intends to continue engagement with HEARD members in Phase 2, exploring with them how to better utilize their knowledge and strengths.

Digital Participation Platform

The Planning Department created a digital participation platform on the project website. This was the first time an interactive participation tool was used by the Department to gather input for policy development. The platform was promoted through GovDelivery bulletins, email announcements, Housing Policy Group meetings, informational meetings, listening sessions, and social media. The platform included the summarized key policy ideas, related topics, and background information. San Francisco residents and community members could comment and rate using a Likert scale each of key policy ideas. In total, 118 people through 383 comments and ratings shared input through the digital participation platform; below are their demographics.
**Figure 1. Digital Participation Platform Demographics**

- **What is your race and ethnicity?**
  - White: 55%
  - Black/African American: 4%
  - Other: 8%
  - East Asian: 18%
  - Latinx / Hispanic: 11%
  - Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander: 3%
  - Middle Eastern / N.African: 3%
  - Other: 3%
  - South Asian: 1%
  - Southeast Asian: 3%

- **What do you identify as?**
  - Female: 46%
  - Male: 52%
  - Gender non-binary: 3%

- **What is your age?**
  - 18 - 39: 53%
  - 40 - 59: 21%
  - 60 or Older: 11%
  - 17 or Younger: 5%

- **What is your household income range?**
  - Less than $50,000: 16%
  - $50,001 to $75,000: 9%
  - $75,001 to $100,000: 14%
  - $100,001 to $125,000: 16%
  - $125,001 to $150,000: 8%
  - $150,001 to $200,000: 7%
  - More than $200,000: 30%

- **What is your current housing situation?**
  - Own: 59%
  - Rent: 37%
  - Roommates living together: 5%
  - Family with children: 29%
  - Related adults living together: 9%
  - Couple (married or unmarried) no children: 31%
  - Live alone: 25%
  - Other: 1%
  - Couch Surfing: 1%
  - Shelter: 2%

- **9% were people with a disability or visual impairment**
Below is a tally of ratings for the 22 key policy ideas. Comments received through the digital participation platform were included in the input summary shared in this report. A full list of all comments and ratings received through the digital participation platform can be found in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Ideas</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a Acknowledge communities affected by institutional racism and make amends</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for past wrongs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b Advance environmental justice by reversing the public health consequences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of discriminatory programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c Champion housing choice for everyone everywhere</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a Protect vulnerable populations at risk of displacement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b Mitigate the impacts of displacement on vulnerable populations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c Support affordable choices for moderate- and middle-income households</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.d Provide shelters and temporary housing with services for people</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiencing homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.e Expand permanent supportive housing for people and families</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiencing homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a Maintain the use of existing housing stock for residential use</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b Preserve affordability of existing housing stock</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c Support converting unused space in existing residential properties</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to new homes for smaller households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d Enhance the quality and resiliency of existing housing stock</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prioritizing vulnerable neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a Increase funding and resources for affordable housing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b Allow more multifamily housing in more areas of the city to accommodate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a diversity of households now and in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.c Accommodate a variety of household types and lifestyles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.d Reduce regulatory barriers to housing development, especially for</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.e Support reduced housing construction costs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.f Improve coordination on housing production at the regional and state</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level as well as with large businesses and institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a Support the City’s climate and environmental sustainability goals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b Improve climate resilience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c Design livable neighborhoods</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey

The Planning Department’s main outreach and engagement goal was to engage communities of color and hard to reach populations, such as those without access to internet, through different outreach and engagement methods. The digital participation platform proved to be ineffective at reaching a diverse pool of respondents due to its complexity and the lack of internet access in the populations the project is striving to reach. Instead, the platform was primarily accessed by the same populations that have historically been engaged with the Planning Department projects. Therefore, to complement the platform and expand engagement, project staff worked with the consultant to create a survey to be administered online and in person. The survey was promoted through GovDelivery bulletins, email announcements, Housing Policy Group meetings, informational meetings, listening sessions, social media and printed posters that were distributed throughout San Francisco.

The Planning Department partnered with HEARD members, the Mission Food Hub, Code Tenderloin, and the consultant to distribute and administer the surveys. HEARD members reached out to their communities, while project staff and consultant
staff administered surveys at the Mission Food Hub. Respondents at this food bank received an incentive package for taking the survey. The Planning Department also partnered with Code Tenderloin, which at the time had 27 health ambassadors covering the 50 blocks that are part of the Tenderloin. Respondents to surveys administered by CODE Tenderloin received tokens for the farmer’s market as an incentive. The table below shows a breakdown of the number of surveys by surveying party and language (there may be some discrepancies as some in-language surveys were entered into Survey Monkey in English).

In total, there were 1,631 individual survey respondents who rated some of the summarized key policy ideas based on their effectiveness in addressing housing challenges and who shared 1,682 comments; below are their demographics.

### II.3 Resident and Community Member Input Summary

Below is a summary of the most common themes in input shared by residents and community members (including the HEARD group) at listening sessions, the digital participation platform, and the survey. Though public input aligned in some cases with the five categories used for the key policy ideas, the project team has expanded the categories for this synthesis to better align with key themes brought about by the community. The key themes are represented in each of the sections below. Where possible, these sections include direct quotations from residents and community members. In some cases, statements from multiple participants and respondents were paraphrased into a single statement.

The Housing Element 2022 Update will carry out the Planning Commission's June 2020 directive to incorporate General Plan policies that explicitly prioritize racial and social equity for American Indian communities, Black communities, and communities of color. Thus, racial and social equity framed listening sessions as well as all other outreach and engagement tools. Residents and community members addressed specific racial equity issues in eight out of fourteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. The most emphatic input on the issue of racial equity came directly from residents.

An overarching theme from community members who have been impacted by structural and institutional racism stressed how “insidious the systems of redlining and other discriminatory practices have been”, even after the practices were outlawed. Participants wanted to know how the Department plans to redress these policies and practices. Community members also expressed concern about policies and programs that have continued to be modeled in exploitative frameworks to the detriment of American Indian, Black and other communities of color. Participants called on the Department to “get to the root of the root” and dismantle institutional racism and the barriers it creates for racialized communities. Participants and respondents also asked the Department to consult with displaced Black and African American people and other people displaced from San Francisco on the best strategies to bring them back or to redress the impact of discriminatory policies and programs that led to their displacement. They also directed the City to provide advancing racial equity at the intersection of housing issues, programs and policies was a main theme for outreach and engagement and is present in each of the sections below.

### Racial Equity

“We cannot put a band-aid on this issue without ending the laws that limited where Black people could live. We have to dismantle this system. There are people who don’t believe that people are forced to live in neighborhoods that are underserved.”

– BMAGIC Listening Session Attendee

The Housing Element 2022 Update will carry out the Planning Commission's June 2020 directive to incorporate General Plan policies that explicitly prioritize racial and social equity for American Indian communities, Black communities, and communities of color. Thus, racial and social equity framed listening sessions as well as all other outreach and engagement tools. Residents and community members addressed specific racial equity issues in eight out of fourteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. The most emphatic input on the issue of racial equity came directly from residents.

An overarching theme from community members who have been impacted by structural and institutional racism stressed how “insidious the systems of redlining and other discriminatory practices have been”, even after the practices were outlawed. Participants wanted to know how the Department plans to redress these policies and practices. Community members also expressed concern about policies and programs that have continued to be modeled in exploitative frameworks to the detriment of American Indian, Black and other communities of color. Participants called on the Department to “get to the root of the root” and dismantle institutional racism and the barriers it creates for racialized communities. Participants and respondents also asked the Department to consult with displaced Black and African American people and other people displaced from San Francisco on the best strategies to bring them back or to redress the impact of discriminatory policies and programs that led to their displacement. They also directed the City to provide
funding for the solutions that result from consulting with the displaced people. The following paragraphs cover the specific needs expressed by different communities.

“Look to these community members for the answers. What do Black folks, or their descendants evicted from the Fillmore during the 1960s urban ‘renewal’ projects, think would be an equitable solution for them? Apply this to many communities intentionally forced out by San Francisco and California’s past and current housing policies.”

– Digital Participation Platform Respondent

Input from the American Indian community, particularly at the HRC Community Roundtable listening session, was centered on three main themes: visibility, restitution, and support for the preservation of their culture. To advance visibility, the American Indian community members requested that: (1) the Planning Department precede all meetings with the Ohlone Ramaytush land acknowledgement legislated by the Board of Supervisors in December 2020; and (2) the Planning Department change the way in which American Indians are being counted to fix undercounting and to improve the data on housing needs. The American Indian community asked for restitution for land stolen and specified that it should come in the form of rental assistance, preference for permanently affordable housing, eviction assistance, homeownership assistance, land dedication and homeless services. They advocated for housing all unhoused American Indians, as they are grossly over-represented in the unhoused population. This action alone would increase the city’s American Indian population by 10% as the unhoused population is not currently counted in the Census. Finally, the community expressed that “culture is life” and asked for support for land dedication for an American Indian Cultural Center as none exists in San Francisco, leaving the Community without a communal space for strengthening cultural ties.

Black and African American community members expressed the need for targeted housing policies, programs and supportive services that prioritize Black and African American people to reverse the long history of structural and institutional anti-Blackness that has permeated all aspects of the Black and African American experience in the United States and that have led to segregation, divestment, trauma and the wholesale displacement of Black and African American communities in San Francisco. Comments, mostly from the BMAGIC, Fillmore/Western Addition and HRC Community Roundtable listening sessions, focused on the need for housing policies and programs aimed at closing the wealth gap, creating

SURVEY SPOTLIGHT

Section 1: Racial and Social Equity

To reverse the long-term impact of discriminatory housing policies that led to disparate health and economic outcomes for communities of color, we could:

A. Offer priorities to American Indian, Black, Latinx and other vulnerable communities of color for housing programs and access.

49% of all survey respondents rated this solution to housing challenges as very effective. The graph below shows how different demographic groups among respondents rated this solution differently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / P. Islander</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx / Hispanic</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African-American</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern / N. African</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't specify</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
intergenerational wealth, removing institutional and non-institutional barriers to housing programs, and generally increasing access to housing, in particular homeownership. In sum, they called on the City to dismantle the system that continues to keep Black/African American people from economic mobility and to right the wrong of wealth removal from the community.

“Some of the programs are modeled on things that have been historically exploitative and purposely caused Black and Asian people to lose their property. [...] The City needs to put a deep subsidy to right the wrongs of wealth removal.”

– BMAGIC Listening Session Attendee

The greatest specific needs listed by the Black and African American community members were more deeply affordable housing specifically for San Francisco’s Black and African American residents and expansion of the Certificate of Preference Program for permanently affordable housing. Certificates of Preference are used to compensate people displaced by Redevelopment Agency actions and their descendants. Community members also stated that there was insufficient outreach and support for the Black and African American community. Black and African American community members identified new developments, gentrification, and the resulting changing neighborhood characteristics leading to a loss of Black and African American culture, people, communities and businesses, and the importance of creating and expanding legacy homeownership and business programs so that properties stay in the hands of the Black and African American community. They also called for elevating and acknowledging Black and African American history, presence, and contributions in our different neighborhoods.

Latinx and Asian community members also expressed the need to redress discrimination in the City’s housing policies and programs. Immigrant community members attending the Chinese language listening session at the Richmond Senior Center and the second Spanish listening session, as well as survey respondents, described experiencing significant barriers to housing access (see Vulnerable Groups section), lack of cultural and language competency in housing programs and services, and experiencing discrimination in mixed income housing and permanently affordable housing. Creating more deeply permanently affordable housing and expanding housing support for low-income Latinx and Asian people was a major theme. Finally, members of the Japantown Cultural District and survey respondents called on the City to repair the harm done to Japanese people through their WWII incarceration and the harm done to both Japanese and Filipino people through redevelopment and urban renewal by expanding the Certificate of Preference program to affected Japanese and Filipino residents and their descendants.

Finally, community members in District 1 and Sunset Forward meetings were appalled when they heard that racist covenants still exist in deeds from the area and recommended the City set up a process to erase racist covenants from San Francisco deeds.

Vulnerable Groups

Residents and community members addressed the needs and challenges of different vulnerable groups in fourteen out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on meeting the needs of seniors, people with disabilities, low-income families with children, single-parent households, youth, and undocumented residents.

Meeting the housing needs of seniors was a major topic of discussion during Sunset Forward meetings, District 7 meetings, the Planning Department-hosted English and Chinese listening sessions, and the Richmond Senior Center Listening Session, along with written input from the online participation platform and the survey. Community members expressed that the City needs to build a lot more senior housing throughout the city, especially for extremely-low-, very-low- and low-income seniors, and as well as for people with disabilities. Some areas that were highlighted as needing senior housing were Bayview Hunter’s Point, Japantown, SOMA, Chinatown, Tenderloin, Fillmore/Western Addition, District 1, District 4, and District 7. Community members also expressed that accessibility in housing units should continue to be a requirement.
“Adults with disabilities are finding it VERY hard to access supportive housing with the increase in home prices.”
– Survey Respondent

Community members from all parts of the city widely identified low-income families with children as a vulnerable group, particularly at the La Voz Latina, BMAGIC and the second Planning Department-hosted Spanish listening sessions, with some District 1, District 4 and District 7 meetings’ attendees also expressing need in the neighborhoods on the western side of the city. Community members expressed urgency in the need to create a lot more permanently affordable housing options that are deeply affordable for low-income families and families of color as they were more vulnerable to displacement, eviction, overcrowding and loss of community. Community members in the Bayview highlighted that housing instability plays a large role in school truancy for children and youth, with some students from displaced families having to stay with extended family and friends in order to continue attending their school and to retain their community. Within this vulnerable group, community members recommended priority for families with children living in Single Room Occupancy hotels (SROs), low-income single-parent households, and low-income families with children with disabilities.

Community members highlighted the housing needs of low-income students, particularly students of color and those unsheltered during the HRC Community Roundtable and the BMAGIC listening sessions. Survey respondents also supported priority in housing programs for vulnerable transitional aged youth, particularly for those coming out of the foster care system. District 4 youth described living in overcrowded conditions, both as renters and in intergenerational households, and a lack of affordable options for them to be able to stay in their neighborhood and the city. Finally, during the BMAGIC listening session there was a suggestion to create services and programs that can accommodate youth if the City plans to renovate Juvenile Hall.

Immigrant participants, particularly those at the Tenderloin Housing Clinic’s La Voz Latina and the second Spanish listening sessions, expressed that undocumented residents experience many barriers in housing access, including permanently affordable housing, due to lack of credit history, lack of a bank account, lack of formal lease history or official proof of income. Attendees also expressed that undocumented residents and extremely low-, very low-, and low-income people are susceptible to predatory practices by landlords that include poor housing conditions (like lack of ventilation, pests, and leaks), extremely expensive utility charges (sometimes to account for rent-control), allowing overcrowding, passing through remodeling expenses, and informal lease agreements, among others. Finally, immigrant community members expressed that permanently affordable housing property managers do not understand the languages spoken, nor offer in-language services that can help address concerns, housing issues, and/or resolve conflicts.

Environmental Justice

We want our communities to thrive in all aspects of life, so I believe it’s important to put time, money and effort into the wellbeing of the people that live in the city.
– Survey Respondent

Residents and community members addressed specific concerns about environmental justice in four out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on the need for safe and healthy housing, and access to healthy foods, open space and healthy environmental conditions.

Attendees at the HRC Community Roundtable and BMAGIC expressed an urgent need for policies to address environmental injustice issues in District 10, among them: addressing toxic earth and air; home repair programs for Black and African American homeowners to improve housing conditions; increasing accessibility of healthy food options, safe green space, safe and healthy affordable housing, and health services; and, prioritizing the neighborhood for policies that address environmental injustice and discrimination. Access to affordable healthy food options was also brought up in the Fillmore/Western Addition listening session. La Voz Latina attendees expressed concern about the unhealthy environments experienced by many low-income residents in the
SURVEY SPOTLIGHT

Section 1: Racial and Social Equity

To reverse the long-term impact of discriminatory housing policies that led to disparate health and economic outcomes for communities of color, we could:

B. **Prioritize low-income neighborhoods** living in poor quality environments for improvements to public amenities (schools, parks, public transit, open spaces, pedestrian safety, health care, etc.)

61% of all survey respondents rated this solution to housing challenges as very effective. The graph below shows how different demographic groups among respondents rated this solution differently:

Tenderloin, which included unsafe and polluted streets that affect air quality and the safety of the children living there, and housing in poor conditions with many experiencing rat and flea infestations, leaks and poor ventilation. Safe and healthy housing conditions were also a major topic for SRO tenants.

Input from the online participation platform and the survey supplemented this feedback centered on environmental justice. Community members highlighted the need for retrofits and infrastructure and building upgrades that enhance the health and resilience of neighborhoods that suffer from environmental injustice. They also stated that the City should ensure that environmentally harmful activities are no longer situated near or in Black and Brown communities. Community members also called for giving environmental justice communities and community organizations "watchdog roles in order to assure new development does not cause harm".

“Make housing safe and healthy regardless of the race, communities, or groups living there. It does not matter what the color of someone's skin when cleaning up hazardous waste.”

- Digital Participation Platform Respondent

Outreach and Engagement

Residents and community members cited gaps and deficiencies in the City’s outreach and engagement for residents from communities affected by racism and discrimination in three out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on the need to guarantee that community outreach and engagement in housing planning, policy, programming, and development is collaborative, shares decision-making, is culturally competent, is in-language when necessary, and addresses the digital divide.
Community members asked the Department to ensure that historically marginalized, disinvested, and oppressed communities were not only centered in housing plans but played an important role in decision-making. Community members called for community-driven planning and land use decision-making in these disenfranchised communities.

Fillmore/Western Addition listening session attendees added that marginalized communities should be able to provide input on private housing developments given the history of their neighborhood. Attendees called on the Department to ensure that private developers perform culturally competent outreach and engagement, and that requirements are strengthened to hold developers truly accountable to community input and responsive to the environmental, historical, artistic and cultural heritage of the neighborhood.

Community members at the Spanish, Chinese and Fillmore/Western Addition listening sessions, and through the digital participation platform and the survey also expressed concern about the number of low-income residents, people of color and immigrant residents that do not know about their housing rights, housing access and housing programs. Community members called on all City-led outreach and engagement to be culturally competent and trauma-informed to ensure the City is affirmatively reaching American Indian, Black and other Communities of Color, as well as low-income residents, to effectively inform them about their rights and housing programs, improve their access to housing, and elevate their voices in housing planning and policy development processes.

Finally, community members requested capacity-building resources for community-based organizations providing comprehensive housing services in neighborhoods to reach more residents with information about housing rights, programs, and access.

**Tenant Protections and Community Stabilization**

Residents and community members widely supported the expansion of tenant protections and anti-displacement programs in nine out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on the need to stabilizing vulnerable communities, expanding programs, improving data collection, and monitoring of no-fault evictions, and protecting rent-controlled units. Input and support for tenant protections and anti-displacement programs came from a diverse range of communities and demographics.

In order to prevent eviction, community members called for the expansion of rental subsidies, including funding and creating a program like Section 8 to increase the diversity of the city; fully funding the Tenant Right to Counsel program and tenant counseling organizations; and, improving outreach and support on tenant rights (culturally competent and in-language), including building capacity for holistic service provision in all neighborhoods, among others.

### Survey Spotlight

**Section 2: Housing Security**

To prevent displacement of San Francisco residents and address homelessness, we could...

a. Expand tenant protections including eviction protections, legal services, local preference programs and rental assistance.

57% of all survey respondents rated this solution to housing challenges as very effective. The graph below shows how different demographic groups among respondents rated this solution differently:

![Survey Results](chart.png)
“I work in the community and support families get access to resources. Evictions are plaguing our families and there is only so much that we can do. It often takes three local non-profits to make something happen for one family, why is that? It takes so much effort and time for us to stay in the neighborhoods we have been in for so long. All tenants should be made aware of their rights once they move in and frequently after.”

– Survey Respondent

Community members focused on the following means to prevent displacement: (1) enforcement and inspections to avoid fraud from owner-move-in evictions; (2) the creation of a rental registry to better target anti-displacement efforts and strengthening relocation assistance and right-to-return rules; (3) the expansion of rent control (Costa Hawkins reform); and, (4) expansion of the Small Sites program.

“Strongest support for a ‘new inventory of rental housing’; make it very inclusive, fund it well, make sure all City departments that deal with housing or buildings contribute data, charge [a] fee and make mandatory for landlords to participate. Hire an outside capable contractor to set up [the] database; put it in [the] Planning Department and accessible to the public so Commissioners have proper data to make planning and project decisions.”

– Survey Respondent

Homeownership and Economic Mobility

Residents and community members elevated homeownership and economic mobility through housing programs as solutions to redress discriminatory and racist policies in five out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on expanding homeownership programs, addressing aspects of current programs that limit economic mobility, and creating and supporting alternative land-ownership models, particularly for American Indian, Black and other communities of color and low-income communities.

Community members at the HRC Community Roundtable, BMAGIC, Fillmore/Western Addition, Spanish and THC’s La Voz Latina listening sessions called on the City to leverage its own funds to give access to homeownership to American Indian, Black and other communities of color and to low-income communities. Attendees for the first three events listed above recommended targeting American Indian and Black African American residents to redress what they described as the insidious wealth-stripping these communities have experienced from discriminatory policies such as redlining. They proposed that these homeownership programs should include institutional and non-institutional homeownership opportunities, low interest loans, grants, and down payment assistance, among others. Attendees also recommended housing programs to be revised to ensure they promote economic mobility, not hinder...
Changes to housing programs could include: (1) making equity from below-market-rate units transferable to heirs and offspring; (2) changing rules so that children coming of age and with an income in below-market-rate units are not accounted in the household income; and, (3) creating rent-to-own permanently affordable housing as many residents have been living in the same apartment for 20+ years and continue to be renters.

Community members at the BMAGIC and Fillmore/Western Addition listening sessions also mentioned that the Below Market Rate (BMR) homeownership program needs to be modified. Community members expressed concern that homeowner association (HOA) fees and amenity prices within mixed-income developments were too high for BMR residents. They also called for inclusive representation of BMR residents in HOAs and other housing decision-making bodies and for legal services for BMR residents to prevent foreclosures and discrimination in mixed-income development, among others.

Finally, both through oral and written input, community members asked the City to create and support alternative land ownership models for long-term tenants to gain ownership and to stabilize communities, such as land trusts, limited equity cooperatives, shared equity models, rent-to-own programs, and other forms of non-traditional ownership, with a focus on those living in low-income communities and American Indian, Black and other communities of color.

**Permanent Affordable Housing Production**

“Build more 100% affordable housing structures. Find multiple means to help support these, i.e. revenue bonds, inclusionary housing requirements, and taxing more the millionaire and billionaire folks in our City.”

– Survey Respondent

Residents and community members widely supported the production of permanently affordable housing in eleven out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on funding, scale of production, affordability, location, redevelopment, amenities, making it available throughout the city and reducing construction cost. Conversely, some community members from neighborhoods in the western part of the city expressed concern over size and location of affordable housing, with some stating that they did not want affordable housing in their neighborhood.

“Equity is a huge issue when it comes to housing. Across the board our community (Mission) is losing valuable members because affordable housing is not accessible. Whatever programs are in place now need to be either redone or given more funding to be effective. It isn't enough to educate people how to apply to new housing opportunities if the opportunities are few and far between. Or even worse you are on an insanely long waitlist(s) for years.”

– Survey Respondent

Most community members advocated for increasing funding for permanently affordable housing and for producing significantly more of it as Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) affordable targets have not been met. Input focused in the production of deeply permanently affordable housing, with some respondents supporting social housing as a way of making housing more deeply affordable. Many participants and respondents also expressed that permanently affordable housing should be available citywide as there is a need for affordable housing everywhere in the city and it would help stabilize communities as well as open high opportunity neighborhoods to low-income households and Communities of Color. Some respondents emphasized that permanently affordable housing should be available in safe neighborhoods and close to transit. Conversely, a few community members from neighborhoods in the western part of the city stated that they did not want permanently affordable housing in their neighborhood. Others who expressed concerns about adding permanently affordable housing focused their concerns on the size of the buildings, the location, the populations being served, and being excluded from new housing opportunities that are targeted to lower-income residents.

“Affordable housing should be built in close proximity to healthcare, grocery stores, transit, etc. since most do not own a car.”

– Survey Respondent
Section 1: Racial and Social Equity

To reverse the long-term impact of discriminatory housing policies that led to disparate health and economic outcomes for communities of color, we could:

C. Ensure affordable housing units are built equitably throughout the city instead of being concentrated on just the east and southeast sides.

62% of all survey respondents rated this solution to housing challenges as very effective. The graph below shows how different demographic groups among respondents rated this solution differently:

Several community members expressed that unit mix and income limits of permanently affordable housing units should match the needs of the neighborhood in which it is located. Communities that have seen a more redevelopment of subsidized housing such as Bayview Hunter’s Point and the Fillmore/Western Addition emphasized that the city should ensure replacement units and amenities are similar or better than the existing ones, that residents are taken care of throughout the process to avoid displacement, and that new units remain accessible to seniors and people with disabilities that were living there before. The same community members also expressed the importance of locating new permanently affordable housing away from sources of pollution or to perform extensive clean ups to reverse environmental injustice. Similarly, there was support for commercial spaces in these developments to be used for
community-based organizations, services that are affordable (e.g. affordable grocery stores), and for people-of-color-owned businesses.

Some community members advocated for streamlining the approval process for permanently affordable housing and reducing or eliminating fees and non-housing related requirements that increase its development cost. There was also support for public land being used for affordable housing as a means of reducing development costs. While some supported the use of public land for 100% permanently affordable housing developments and private developments with at least 50% permanently affordable units, others expressed emphatically that public land should only be used for 100% permanently affordable housing, while a few wanted public land that is green space to remain as such.

“100% affordable on public lands. We do not have a supply problem for market rate housing, only affordable housing. Focus on this.”

– Survey Respondent

Permanent Affordable Housing Access and Eligibility

“The main focus is not on what is needed most, but who needs it most.”

– Fillmore /Western Addition resident

Residents and community members emphasized the need to improve permanently affordable housing access and eligibility in seven out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on the perception that the program is not serving those that need it most and on barriers to access the program, such as the application process, requirements, outreach, and enforcement. Community members expressed an urgent need to expand access and remove barriers for eligibility for permanently affordable housing.

Another key theme in listening sessions, the online participation platform and the survey was a focus on producing considerably more deeply affordable housing units accessible to extremely low, very low- and low-income households, and targeting American Indian, Black and Latinx communities for these units as they are more vulnerable to high rent burden, eviction, displacement, and homelessness.

Community members emphasized that most permanently affordable housing units aren’t affordable to extremely low, very low-income households since income limits are set based on citywide median incomes. They shared that these median incomes do
not account for economic disparities between white and American Indian, Black and other communities of color. Community members from community-based organizations representing Black communities stressed that if the City wants to reverse the displacement of its Black residents, it should expand rental subsidy programs to create deeper levels of affordability and actively target Black residents for those units.

Latinx community members expressed that having to apply for each affordable housing development separately is burdensome and discouraging, especially for households with little digital literacy, poor access to internet and technology, those concerned with meeting their immediate needs, and those with lower incomes where competition is high for the very limited number of units available. Most of those who have applied expressed that the inflexible income limits and the stringent eligibility requirements have left people out even when winning the lottery. Many community members suggested modifying the Dahlia system to prioritize need, and that prioritization should be given to those who have lived in San Francisco for a long time, are at risk of eviction, displacement and/or homelessness, live in the same neighborhoods as the developments, families with children (and in particular for single mothers and those with children with disabilities), seniors, and other vulnerable groups. Communities of color highlighted that many do not know about the housing programs available and how to apply for them, and that culturally competent outreach was needed to reach the people that need permanently affordable housing the most.

Finally, renters and homeowners of permanently affordable units both expressed that the programs lacked flexibility to be able to move to a different unit as their household size and need changes, which can hinder their economic mobility.

**Homeless Housing and Supportive Services**

Residents and community members widely maintained that the City should continue to support people experiencing homelessness, with several emphasizing that addressing homelessness should be a priority for the City in six out of fourteen listening sessions and on the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on the expansion and improvement of homeless housing and supportive services, including the need for more temporary, transitional, and permanent supportive housing.

In terms of homeless housing improvements, unhoused residents and community members working in homeless service provision expressed that temporary housing, in particular shelters, tend to be in poor condition and unsafe and that temporary housing rules pose a barrier for unhoused people. In addition, SRO tenant leaders cited a lack of supportive services in permanent supportive SROs. Input received advocated for increasing and improving homeless supportive services, such as behavioral health services (mental health and substance use), job training, counseling, providing employment opportunities, and expanding rental subsidies. Language capacity and cultural competency was also highlighted as an important improvement to service provision. Tenderloin residents believed that increasing efforts in addressing homelessness would impact positively the safety and cleanliness of their neighborhood and the many families that live there.

Participants at the BMAGIC listening session, HRC’s Community Roundtable and the District 1 Town Hall elevated the intersection between homelessness and race: American Indian and Black unhoused people are overrepresented among those experiencing homelessness due to systemic and structural racism. Communities members advocated for prioritizing Black and American Indian unhoused people in homeless housing and service provision. Community members at HRC’s Community Roundtable and other listening sessions, as well as online and in the survey, also highlighted the intersections between homelessness and incarceration, mental health, substance use, and age (seniors and youth) as issues the Housing Element should address through its policies and programs. HRC’s Community Roundtable attendees recommended the City strengthens transitional housing programs for formerly incarcerated people. Written comments also expressed prioritizing homeless families with children for housing.

Tensions rose among community members who disagreed about the City’s homelessness efforts. Some respondents expressed animosity towards unhoused residents and stated that funds were better
spent elsewhere, like stabilizing housed residents. Most of these participants expressed a preference for support for middle-income households and a concern that increasing expenditure in homeless housing and supportive services attracts more unhoused people to San Francisco. At the other end of the spectrum, advocates for the homeless cited the following concerns: (1) non-profit housing contributes to the cycle of homelessness and most non-profit housing providers have predatory tactics that they use to keep/evict their tenants; (2) non-profit housing is so poorly supervised by MOHCD that there is no incentive for them to perform better; and, (3) the ONE system that assesses “vulnerability” of tenants does not have an honest relationship with the organizations that seek to house the most vulnerable populations in San Francisco.

**Preserving Affordability and Improving Conditions of Existing Housing**

Residents and community members emphasized preserving affordability of existing housing in five out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey mostly. Input focused on the conservation of rent controlled units, Single Room Occupancy residential hotels (SROs), and permanent affordable housing.

A significant theme in both listening sessions and through written input was frustration about the number of vacant properties. Community members expressed concern about the impact of vacancy on affordability by limiting San Francisco’s housing stock, as well as concerns about how this could signal speculatary practices that could worsen the city’s affordable housing crisis. Input focused on calling the City to evaluate the vacancy situation and institute a vacancy tax or fee that would incentivize property owners to put the units back in the market.

Community members also called for the protection and expansion of rent controlled units, either by preventing their removal through demolition/redevelopment, ensuring their replacement if that does happen, or through condo conversions. However, the main focus around rent control was an expansion of the policy, which included expanding it to newer units or all rentals, outlawing rent controlled units that are used as corporate rentals, having vacancy control and advocating for Costa Hawkins reform or abolishment; or by expanding the Small Sites program so that more buildings can be stabilized. However, there was concern about how the Small Sites program may remove rent control protections from tenants and how residents may experience rent increases and household restructuring due to income averaging policies and other policies. Participants stated that, when redeveloping, rent controlled units should be replaced, a relocation plan should be put in place for tenants, and tenant should have a right to return.

Community members mostly agreed that Single Room Occupancy residential hotels (SROs) are a valuable affordable housing resource for low-income people and expressed concern about the loss of its affordability due to renovations and conversions, and the resulting displacement of low-income tenants. Community members called the City to protect SROs from conversions either by changing the policies...
or purchasing or master leasing them to stabilize their tenants. SRO tenants also advocated for rents to be capped at 30% of income and expressed concern about the run-down and unsafe conditions of some SROs, and the lack of supportive services in SRO buildings that should be supportive housing. Participants specifically pointed out that many people in supportive SROs still do not have access to mental health and substance use services to improve their living situation and of everyone in the building.

Finally, the preservation of permanently affordable housing at risk of market-rate conversion continued to be a priority. However, most of the comments about existing permanently affordable housing focused on poor property management that has led to unattended maintenance issues and tenant concerns. Community members called for proper monitoring of permanently affordable housing developers and property managers, and strict standards for management in benefit of tenants.

### Housing Production

Residents and community members widely discussed the role of housing production in meeting housing needs and addressing the affordability crisis in eight out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on the roles of market rate housing, where growth should go and how it should be built, the relationship between market rate housing and permanent affordable housing, and incentives for housing production. Input heard illustrates major disagreements amongst various groups about the role of housing production and affordability crisis. Many community members, particularly from neighborhoods that have seen a lot of displacement and gentrification, felt that we cannot build ourselves out of this affordability crisis; that affordable housing had to prioritized; and, that strategies and policies that actually stabilize people in place and prevent

---

**SURVEY SPOTLIGHT**

**Section 4: Building More Housing**

To ensure we build different types of housing for all types of households, including affordable housing, we could...

**C. Create zoning changes that allow for small multi-unit apartments in low density residential neighborhoods.**

54% of all survey respondents rated this solution to housing challenges as very effective. The graph below shows how different demographic groups among respondents rated this solution differently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely-Low to Low Income</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t specify</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern / N. African</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx / Hispanic</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / P. Islander</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African-American</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t specify</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
displacement must be prioritized. Perhaps the input that best captures this perspective is the following quote:

“Many of these communities have rejected the trickle-down theory of private development and see how market-rate housing development is harmful to the community and increases gentrification and displacement. [...] Prioritizing luxury housing for wealthy individuals must be acknowledged as part of the problem and not the solution.”

– Digital Participation Platform Respondent

Community members from neighborhoods on the east side of the city expressed that the market rate housing being built does not cover the needs of their communities; that there was a disconnect between need and what is being built. Additionally, they expressed that community members have a hard time seeing the benefit of these developments in their neighborhoods, as they felt permanently affordable housing programs do not allow targeting of specific residents for the units.

Meanwhile, another perspective was shared by community members who felt that market rate development still played an important role in generating funds for permanently affordable housing and in meeting the high demand for non-subsidized housing. These community members identified a great need for permanently affordable housing and the City’s limited funding as their reason to support market-rate housing. Community members that supported this idea felt that both market rate developers and larger employers had to be held accountable to the city’s affordability crisis by producing enough housing for the increase in higher income workforce that put San Francisco’s housing market at strain.

---

SURVEY SPOTLIGHT

Section 4: Building More Housing

To ensure we build different types of housing for all types of households, including affordable housing, we could...

D. Create zoning changes that would allow for more housing along transit corridors in the west side of the city along transit corridors (Richmond, Sunset, Parkside, West Portal, City College, etc.).

54% of all survey respondents rated this solution to housing challenges as very effective. The graph below shows how different demographic groups among respondents rated this solution differently:
Another group of community members felt that "legalizing" dense housing everywhere should be a priority to address years of housing underproduction, scarcity, and exclusionary zoning. Community members recommended strategies ranging from supporting full density and height decontrol in the entire city (basically not having any zoning limits for housing) to people who felt the City could just move to form-based controls by removing density limits everywhere, while keeping height limits in single-family-residential areas, increasing heights along transportation corridors and making denser permanently affordable housing permittable everywhere.

A fourth perspective was shared by some community members who live in on the west side of the city and only want affordable housing to be built in their neighborhood, with no interest in small multifamily buildings or denser buildings in commercial and transportation corridors. Some of these community members wanted affordable housing to be small (no more than four units).

Despite this core disagreement, a lot of community members felt that if the City was to continue to grow, it should accommodate growth equitably, meaning that eastern part of the city should not carry the vast brunt of it, and that other neighborhoods that have seen very little housing production and have more opportunities should start carrying an equitable portion of it. Community members also asked for an equitable distribution of housing development relative to desired outcomes, not just about distribution of numbers of units.

Another major theme regarding housing production was creating incentives for housing to be built and to be affordable to middle-income residents. Some community members felt that in order to achieve this the City needed to streamline approval for 100% affordable housing of any size throughout the city, and that we need to legalize by-right construction of Missing Middle housing as a potentially affordable option for moderate income households even without subsidy. Attendees at the District 4 town hall wondered how the city could incentivize housing developers to build for affordability, particularly for middle income families, first responders, and teachers. In order to incentivize the construction of Additional Dwelling Units (ADUs), community members called on the city to loosen policies that may limit their size and to create financing programs to help low- and moderate-income homeowners, as well as seniors add ADUs for supplemental income.

Housing Choice as Household Size and Needs Change

Ensuring affordable housing choices everywhere in Residents and community members elevated the need for housing choices for different household types in seven out of fifteen listening sessions and primarily through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on ensuring affordable housing choices everywhere in the city as residents age and their needs change.

Generally, community members expressed that switching housing as households grow or shrink and needs change should be fluid and affordable options...
should be available everywhere. Input focused on the fact that having a lot of different housing types everywhere in the city not only would increase affordability, but it would also serve the housing needs of our residents better. Some housing types highlighted were ADUs, multifamily buildings with larger units for families with children, housing changes that allow for intergenerational families, and assisted living for people with disabilities as well as people with mental and behavioral health issues.

Attendees of the District 4 and District 1 town halls, Sunset Forward meetings, District 7 meetings, the Planning Department-hosted English and Chinese listening sessions, and the Richmond Senior Center listening session expressed concern about the lack for affordable housing options for seniors and middle-income families that do not qualify for permanently affordable. Many seniors from the neighborhoods on the western side of the city expressed that downsizing was difficult as there were not choices for them to move into that were affordable, met their needs, and allowed them to stay in their neighborhood. Others expressed that ease and support for adding ADUs to their homes or funding programs that match seniors with those looking for cheaper rent and/or to share a house with a senior would allow them to age in place and increase housing choices in their neighborhoods.

Permanently affordable housing residents, in both homeownership and renter programs, expressed concern about the lack of ease in switching units as households grow or shrink. They called for more fluidity in these housing programs.

### Increasing Opportunity and Redressing Divestment in Priority Neighborhoods

Residents and community members elevated the need for investing in divested and underserved communities in six out of fifteen listening sessions and mostly through the digital participation platform and the survey. Input focused on bringing services, infrastructure and amenities to neighborhoods that had been left behind by the City.

Community members, in particular those who attended the BMAGIC and Fillmore/Western Addition listening sessions, called for policies that reverse the effects of racist policies from the past that segregated Black and African American communities and other communities of color and forced them to live in neighborhoods that have been disinvested creating huge health, wealth, housing, environmental and economic disparities for these communities. Community members living in underserved and segregated neighborhoods saw their neighborhoods as multifaceted and expressed pride in the invaluable culturally competent community resources and support that they have built in the face of adversity, despite the longstanding lack of investment in services, amenities and infrastructure. They called for the City to prioritize these neighborhoods for investments to bring all these needs to their neighborhoods to redress structural and institutional racism and discrimination, and to be able to continue to live where they have roots.

---

**SURVEY SPOTLIGHT**

**Section 2: Housing Security**

To prevent displacement of San Francisco residents and address homelessness, we could...

D. Subsidize housing for eligible middle-income households such as teachers, nurses, and first responders.

56% of all survey respondents rated this solution to housing challenges as very effective. The graph below shows how different demographic groups among respondents rated this solution differently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely-Low to Low Income</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t specify</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
In five listening sessions and through written comments on the online participation platform and the survey, community members expressed the need for the City to prioritize investment and improvement in accessibility to open space, parks and playgrounds, safety, healthy environments (e.g. free of toxic air and land, clean, etc.), good schools, healthy and affordable food options, affordable health services, efficient and affordable transit, and economic development in disinvested neighborhoods, neighborhoods that were redlined, neighborhoods that aren’t traditionally considered “residential” but where a lot of families live and enjoy good access to transportation, services and jobs (e.g. SOMA, Tenderloin, etc.), or that have experienced environmental injustice. Community members also expressed that the City should continue to build permanently affordable housing in these neighborhoods as a stabilization strategy that allows residents to stay in their communities. There was also a lot of concern on the impact of displacement on people-of-color-owned and -serving businesses and calls for the City to invest in economic development in these communities to address economic disparities.

Finally, community members and community-based organizations, particularly among the American Indian, Black and African American, Filipino and Latinx communities, expressed the need to build capacity among community-based organizations in historically disinvested and disenfranchised neighborhoods on holistic housing service provision, supportive service provision, neighborhood planning and affordable housing development.

High-Opportunity Neighborhoods

Residents and community members discussed opening high-opportunity neighborhoods for housing in seven out of fifteen listening sessions and through the digital participation platform and the survey mostly. Input focused on ensuring affordable housing choices everywhere in the city as residents age and their needs.

District 1, District 4 and District 7 meeting attendees, as well as community members from other areas of the city, felt that the State was putting a lot of pressure on their neighborhoods to change their zoning restrictions; in particular, through laws like the proposed SB-50 that called for state-imposed rezoning of transit corridors and AB-686 (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Law or AFFH) which called on local governments to open housing access in high opportunity neighborhoods and neighborhoods with restricted characteristics (i.e. single-family-zoned). Whether or not to change and how was a major topic of discussion among meeting attendees, and community members that provided input through the online participation platform and the survey.

Some community members from neighborhoods on the western side of the city objected zoning changes reinforcing that the aesthetic of their neighborhoods should be preserved to protect views, air and light, since these were characteristics that initially drew them to these neighborhoods. Others expressed wanting to have a say on how growth was accommodated in their neighborhood given that changes were

SURVEY SPOTLIGHT

Section 5: Sustainability, Climate Resilience, Livability

To make existing and future housing sustainable, climate resilient, and livable, we could…

F. Plan for parks, schools, libraries, transit, and pedestrian safety within neighborhoods as the city’s population grows

66% of all survey respondents rated this solution to housing challenges as very effective. The graph below shows how different demographic groups among respondents rated this solution differently:
likely to happen. Community members in this camp often favored incremental changes or approaches where height limits remained in most single-family-zoned areas (with some favoring fourplexes and others density decontrol), except in commercial and transportation corridors where they believed there could be higher heights to accommodate affordable housing.

Despite these two differing perspectives, most District 1, District 4 and District 7 community members did recognize the need for affordable housing in their neighborhoods and approved of it, particularly housing for seniors and families with children and for other people of color who want to move there. Supporters of affordable housing in these areas saw commercial and transit corridors as the locations for this type of housing. These community members also expressed concern about the lack of affordable options for them or their offspring to move into as they age, with many fearing that their kids will not be able to grow old in their own neighborhoods.

A vast majority of community members supported creating a plan to allow multifamily housing development, particularly permanently affordable housing, in high-opportunity neighborhoods that have historically excluded low income people and people of color. Community members at the HRC’s Community Roundtable and BMAGIC listening sessions called the City to end the laws that limited where Black and African American people could live. YIMBY and English listening session attendees, a few attendees of District 1, District 4 and District 7 meetings, and others that participated through written input felt that the bans on apartments and other “missing middle” housing on single-family-zoned areas have been and continue to be a major driver of high housing costs, housing inequality and displacement of vulnerable communities, and that modifying zoning restrictions could also relieve development pressure from Eastern neighborhoods. Low-income community members welcomed the possibility of having access to affordable housing in high-opportunity areas such as District 1, District 4 and District 7 among others. Finally, there was a call to develop strategies to ensure that housing development isn’t just allowed in high opportunity neighborhoods but that it occurs.

### II.4 Outreach and Engagement for the Housing Policy Group

The Planning Department convened a Housing Policy Group (HPG) to help the City study possible strategies to pursue through the Housing Element. The HPG includes a cross section of people and organizations who have been active in policy discussions around housing production, affordability, and land use in San Francisco. The group includes tenant advocates, housing rights advocates, community development leaders, nonprofit and for-profit real estate developers, real estate industry leaders, social service providers, homeownership advocates, and others.

#### Housing Policy Group Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invited to participate</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in at least 1 meeting</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In July and August of 2020, the Planning Department convened the HPG for a series of five focus group discussions of housing policy options for the City. The initial round of discussions focused on soliciting feedback on the Departments draft of Key Policy Ideas. Topics included strategies for advancing racial equity, promoting neighborhood sustainability/climate change, increasing housing production, and preserving affordability of existing housing units. The following were the titles of these meetings:

1. Advancing Racial and Social Equity
2. Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhoods
3. Increasing Housing Choice Including Affordable Housing
4. Preserving Affordability and Enhancing Resiliency of Existing Housing
5. Anti-displacement Policies and Homelessness Prevention
Based on these initial discussions as well as the other community feedback the Department collected, the HPG was reconvened in December of 2020 for three additional meetings focused on deeper discussions of more targeted issues. The three follow up meetings focused on:

1. Prioritizing investments in community stabilization programs for American Indian, Black, and other people of color and to address segregated geographies/poverty concentration;

2. Investing in more affordable housing in High-resourced neighborhoods and affordable housing strategies in Disadvantaged Communities; and,

3. Strategies to support the private sector to produce small multifamily housing for middle-income households.

We have provided a sample of the valuable input shared from those meetings in the Housing Policy Group Input Summary in the next section. Where possible, the summaries below include direct quotations from meeting participants. In some cases, we have paraphrased comments from multiple stakeholders into a single statement. For the most part, input is presented here as it was heard in the meeting; therefore, the content is recorded in notetaking form without grammatical or other editing.

6 Key Take Aways From Both Phases of Discussion

These discussions touched on a great many important topics. The following five questions arose repeatedly and elicited the most discussion and thought from HPG stakeholders.

1. How can San Francisco make up for its history of racially exclusionary land use policy?

HPG Stakeholders generally all agreed that the City should continue efforts to target housing resources to Black, American-Indian, Latinx and other communities of color that have disproportionately faced displacement in recent years. There was no clear consensus about how exactly to define that targeting. Some favored using ‘sensitive communities’ maps to identify neighborhoods most at risk while others favored explicit preferences based on household race. Many pointed out the need for better data on the needs of these communities.

While everyone agreed that reversing displacement was important, some questioned whether it was the right goal for San Francisco. Some felt that, given that displacement was ongoing and that City policies were still contributing to displacement it would be better to state a goal of stopping displacement. Others felt that that it was important for the city to commit to the more ambitious vision of reversing displacement.

While few stakeholders were willing to name one program that was currently the most effective in preventing or reversing displacement, the Small Sites program, inclusionary housing program, affordable housing resident selection preferences and rental assistance programs were most frequently mentioned in these discussions. Most of the discussion, however, was focused on how these programs could be refined to better achieve this goal.

2. What kind of process would make these actions feel legitimate or meaningful?

Stakeholders generally all agreed that the City should invest more effort into meaningful community level planning. Many articulated a need for the City to take the lead from communities and invest in community-led planning efforts - allowing impacted communities to come up with their own plans and identify their own priorities. Others pointed to the need for the City to provide funding to community organizations to do this work.

3. What patterns of development would support equitable growth for the future?

Participants discussed three land use growth concepts – one focusing new growth on the east side in areas that have seen most of recent building, one focusing growth along transit
corridors throughout the city and one focusing a larger share of growth in neighborhoods with existing lower density residential zoning. In general, the Transit Corridors concept received the most attention and support. Some stakeholders saw it as the most effective strategy for increasing the share of new housing built on the west side of the city. Others pointed out that the strategy would require additional investment in affordable housing and transit infrastructure if it was going to be used to further equity. There was also a lot of interest in the Residential Growth scenario which relied on more distributed and smaller scale building. Some saw this as a way to share the burdens of growth most equitably but some worried about how affordable housing would be incorporated in this strategy. While some people objected to the East Side scenario on the grounds that concentrating even more building in these neighborhoods could further gentrification, most agreed that continuing to build affordable housing on the east side was critical.

While there was broad agreement that the City should do everything, it can to expand the supply of affordable housing, participants were split on the question of whether new market rate housing helps or hurts overall affordability. Some participants felt strongly that building more housing (even expensive housing) is key to bringing costs down and reducing displacement pressures while others felt that new market rate housing was contributing to displacement and competing with nonprofit affordable housing for land and other resources.

4. What would it take to build more new housing in areas that have not seem much building in recent decades?

Stakeholders generally felt that it was appropriate for the City to increase its efforts to locate new housing and affordable housing in particular in neighborhoods that have historically not included much affordable housing. Most agreed that doing so would require new strategies and techniques. Many participants stressed the importance of including communities in the process – both in the creation of maps or boundaries and in the crafting of neighborhood level affordable housing strategies. Some felt that including people would not be sufficient and argued that new requirements and rules would be needed to overcome resistance in some areas.

5. What neighborhood improvements should be prioritized to strengthen underserved communities?

At the same time, most participants also agreed that the City should continue to invest in expanding affordable housing opportunities in the neighborhoods where most of the affordable units are currently concentrated. Several stakeholders stressed the need for more investment in capacity building for community-led organizations with strong ties to impacted communities. Others pointed to a need for better data about who is being served by existing housing strategies.

6. How could the City support the private sector to produce small multifamily housing for middle-income households?

Many stakeholders were able to identify specific incentives which could help encourage development of smaller projects including projects that were priced to serve more moderate-income households. Most commonly mentioned were reductions in the level of impact fees, reductions in affordable housing requirements and streamlining of the approvals process. Most seemed to agree that direct affordable housing subsidy should be reserved for lower-income housing and not used to underwrite middle-income housing.

There were mixed opinions about whether new housing in smaller infill buildings would tend to be less expensive than most of the new housing currently being built. Some felt strongly that if the City were to expand the zoning and provide other incentives that enough new housing could be build that it would bring the prices/rents down noticeably. Others felt that the market demand was so strong that any new housing would be far too expensive for even middle-income families. Some felt that it would be possible for the city to tie incentives to requirements that some or all of the new units in these buildings be sold or rented to qualified middle income residents.
II.5 Housing Policy Group Input Summary

Phase I Round 1 Meetings in July and August (Five Meetings Total)

In July and August, San Francisco housing policy stakeholders participated in at least one of the five Housing Policy Group (HPG) meetings for the Housing Element 2022 Update. The prompt questions asked for each meeting are listed below.

Advancing Racial and Social Equity

- How has historic discrimination affected the housing challenges of the communities you serve?
- How do we make up for this history, what kind of action would move towards healing as it relates to people’s housing access and conditions?
- What kind of process would make these actions feel legitimate or meaningful? What are some transformational steps that the Department can take?

Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhoods

- What neighborhood improvements should be prioritized to strengthen underserved communities, especially in the face of health and climate crises?
- How could community benefits from new housing serve existing neighbors, especially vulnerable and historically marginalized communities?

Increasing Housing Choice Including Affordable Housing

- Are there aspects of the potential growth patterns that would further worsen existing inequities? Are there aspects that would generate more resistance?
- What would it take for more neighbors to support new housing?

- What role can the housing element play to ensure that we secure the funding we need for affordable housing?

Preserving Affordability and Enhancing Resiliency of Existing Housing

- How could we better understand speculative trends affecting housing affordability?
- If the City were to allow private development to purchase properties to meet affordability requirements, what are some of the pros and cons of this strategy in relation to advancing racial equity?
- What health, safety or other conditions should we prioritize for improvement for low-income homeowners and tenants in disadvantaged neighborhoods (communities of color or low income)?

Anti-displacement Policies and Homelessness Prevention

- Should the goal be to reduce displacement, eliminate displacement, reverse displacement or something else?
- Has San Francisco been prioritizing the most effective anti-displacement programs and policies?

Because the discussions overlapped quite a bit in their content, we have organized this summary into the following cross-cutting categories:

I. Communities of color: experiences and concerns
II. Approach to solutions
III. Specific solutions
IV. Community engagement process
V. Metrics of evaluation
I. COMMUNITIES OF COLOR: EXPERIENCES AND CONCERNS

This section highlights some of the experiences of BIPOC and low-income communities and some specific concern for each community. It does not represent a comprehensive discussion of experiences and concerns but examples that were highlighted in our meetings.

American Indian Population

- Restitution for American Indians:
  - Rental assistance
  - Eviction assistance
  - First time homebuyer – build equity to pass on
  - Homelessness services

- Tell the right story about American Indians and use better data working with those communities

- Need for a cultural center for American Indians in addition to housing—the community revolves around ceremonies

Black and African American Population

- Illegal actions from landlords towards black tenants even amongst the Housing Authority properties

- Certificate of preference program has a narrow eligibility; the units that are available under that preference are still not affordable for the people that were evicted or displaced; People have to find which buildings are have a lottery and apply using the CoP – there is too much burden on the person trying to find housing. The CoP is building by building

- Bayview - amongst most impacted population - heart disease, cancer, asthma, etc. People don’t feel like they have opportunities - manifests in community safety, feelings of mistrust, etc.

- BIPOC also concerned about increased hostility and policing from upscale residents discrimination

Filipino Population

- Used to have 5,000 Filipinos in SOMA, but now half of that because of the different types of developments being built in the neighborhood.

Chinese Population

- 5% of families in SROs don’t qualify for city affordable housing because they make less than 55% of AMI. COVID has had a devastating effect. 45% has stated that they have 0 income due to the pandemic. Nearly half of our families now have 0 income.

Low-Income Populations

- We have some income levels that are getting like 4,000 applications and other AMI level that are getting like 100 applications. This is privileging higher income people with better odds. what is the AMI ranges that are actually needed based on current residence and actual incomes of the population.

- We see BMR homeowners dealing with problems with their HOA. we need to deal with HOA issues.

- I’ve seen eviction notices processed for families that have outgrown their units. Evictions because they no longer fit the size requirements for the units.

- some people reject job offers so they don’t disqualify from housing (affordable housing)

II. APPROACH TO SOLUTIONS

This section summarizes comments regarding our general approach to housing solutions, what values we lead with, how far our racial equity focus will reach, and how affordability can be achieved. In addition, this section includes comments on three land use concepts illustrating how the city could grow and how those changes can bring equitable outcomes.

Racial Equity Framing

- Housing needs to be looked at as a health crisis

- [The values] some are qualified, some are not qualified. When MEDA looks at these, it’s no displacement as opposed to minimum displacement. Instead of Racial Equity lens, Racial Equity FIRST lens. Would like to see unqualified statements.
Explicit in pursuing reparations (HOPE SF as a model). Truth Telling -> Restitution -> Reconciliation -> Liberation in the short-mid term, we can make significant movement toward Truth Telling and Restitution

How are you going to fund this racial and social equity?

Eliminate Displacement

Focus on stabilization and preventing displacement

Fundamental question is one of geography and scale: at what point is community stabilization happening, what scale is diversity ensured.

Deep focus on low-income/predominately POC and how can we ensure they have long-term affordability

preservation results in faster delivery [than production], maintains neighborhood character

We need to eliminate displacement entirely, while still practical, it could be incremental, but we have to set our sights high

similar to vision zero, we need a north star, zero displacement

we should also work towards reversing displacement recognizing that BIPOC and LI have been pushed out

We can say eliminate displacement. Not too ambitious.

Thinking a little about who we are trying to change these trends for is important. Prioritize low-income communities and communities of color

Doubtful that we can bring people back. When people leave, they are lost to San Francisco for good.

The City is unaffordable for its teachers, nurses, there’s a whole host of middle-income people in the City that cannot live here. If we continue this trend, we won’t be able to hire, we’ll have consistent turnover. We can only look at displacement of low-income but also moderate and middle income residents in San Francisco

Reducing displacement would open up more affordable housing as portion of new production goes to people who have been displaced.

Strategies for Affordable Housing

Growth objectives of SF have centered on wealthy corporations and private actions, building the City as the primary financial capital in West Coast. This has shaped racist policies – from urban renewal (explicit) to today (implicit).

Decouple market rate housing from affordable housing; how do we work outside of market strategies to get folks back in housing?

Feel strongly that market rate housing is a huge component of affordable housing due to funding. Also, that more market rate housing brings down cost generally.

Where it’s worked better like Octavia Boulevard, where you have a broad area to create these ratios, you get you closer to the goals. If you can dedicate enough sites as affordable, developers could make it happen. Land prices went down, construction prices went down, capital is not going to market rate.

Just building more housing won’t solve the issue because it won’t trickle down or be accessible to low-income households.

Build, build mentality that housing will trickle down; those things are violent and cause more eviction and displacement; [We should] take housing off the private market [and focus on] community-based zoning and land use policies that work to prioritize things like affordable housing and open space

You can’t build enough housing to change the situation because of the economics – luxury gets built. The only housing that should be approved and built is 100% affordable for low-income and moderate income.
• This idea of every market rate unit is luxury housing is driven by cost; you run out of market if you were only building to the top 10%; just by getting cost down you could get down to the middle market

• There’s a relationship between affordable and market, they are competing for land, one of the ways you encourage the ability of the city to buy land is to discouraging selling the entitled land -- > not make it harder for private market, but not encouraging it even more

• We need to figure out how affordable housing developers can get ahead of market rate developers in the process, or how can market rate developers produce more units so we can get more fees.

Equity Impacts of New Housing/Displacement and Gentrification

• Planning should prioritize adding infill and market-rate development in areas that do not have the displacement pressures.

• How do you make sure displacement and gentrification doesn’t happen? If you make the neighborhood more appealing it will drive up costs.

• Three ways a new project can serve the existing community
  » Ground floor space – is it space that a lower-income person can go?
  » Local hire – are the jobs for us? Is it going to provide low-income people jobs?
  » Do we have financial access – places that have a neighborhood special, everyone else pays more (ex. Special items for neighbors on restaurant menus etc)

• Need Racial Equity analysis for development projects: have a racial/equity test embedded in the analysis to make sure the development will benefit BIPOC/low-income communities. Make the burden of proof on developer and city. What happens over a 1, 5, 10 year window is different over a 20-year window.

• No assessment who lives in the surrounding area, what psychological displacement they might feel. Not required in the CEQA process, if we will center in racial and social equity it should include that. Consideration of a socio-economic impact analysis. To have that in a separate document so that we can get a sense, but why is this not included

• Evenly distribute housing through the city, because we do have the research that shows economically, and ethnically diverse communities is how you get to economic opportunities for next generation of historically marginalized groups.

  » mixed income models help integration

• Use sensitive communities map. Ensure these communities will be safeguarded. If we’re thinking of multifamily housing, do it in high resource areas by increasing height limits

Three Land Use Concepts for Growth Patterns:

• East side concept
  » going to accelerate and exacerbate gentrification problems.
  » Recent history has shown that development on east side has increased speculation which exacerbates gentrification.

• Transit Corridor Concept
  » Like transit corridor idea and increasing heights along transit corridors. Primarily working class families using public transit. More affordable housing on transit corridor. Then looking into race/equity before expanding to market-rate. Lower-income families benefit and not be displaced
  » Preferences very specific to those that live there or used to live there. If it seems appealing,
who’s going to be able to get that space. Overly emphasize who the housing is for. The marketing needs to be so specific so we can intentionally keep people in.

» Local density program is not being used, the state density will turn a bigger profit margin. Incentives can be specific to neighborhood. For example, district 2, what rules can we put it place for more housing in there. Also try and make that affordable housing is developed by right.

» There are certain neighborhoods that bear the benefits of the in-lieu fees. Want to see more housing in transit corridors for families who would use them. We upzoned a lot of corridors in Valencia and the Mission and we saw a lot of competing power going on over the last decade between affordable housing and private developers. We need to make sure that any effort that increases density along a lot of these really right transit corridors really need to benefit those who are going to benefit most from the transit.
  - Right of refusal
  - Right transit corridors and corner lots – Outer Richmond and sunset
  - At least 80 housing units on a site to make it pencil for an affordable housing development
  - Focus on who’s going to benefit once we change the zoning.
  - To do this equitably, if you’re a landowner choosing to sell to an affordable housing developer, the affordable housing developer should be exempt from CEQA.
  - Forces market rate developers to do joint ventures with affordable housing developers to avoid CEQA process (80-20 deals)
  - With the outer Richmond, people are not scared of affordable housing, they’re scared of density.

» Like the idea of CEQA reform to incentivize the production of affordable housing. If you can take off some of the timeline (re: CEQA), and take off some of the approval process ….

• Residential Growth Concept

» Third model allows for lower scale development and would bring smaller developers that have been priced out and cannot do larger developments.

» If there are ways to look at areas for high homeownership and high-income average, is there a way to incentivize the homeowner to change their property to a multifamily unit. How do we stop NIMBY at the same time giving more voice to those that have been historically neglected?

» Has a lot of benefits to the third model. But also thinking about how behind we are for LI and VLI households. Need balance between the two goals. Small multifamily are more economical market rate housing is still going to be dramatically out of reach for most of the lowest income….

» These benefits are often not talked about. Without a market rate pipeline, we don’t get fees to build supportive housing. If we just do low-density, we don’t get the higher benefits locally. Need to partner with OEWD to have workforce and economic development as components. Seeking out small businesses for ground floor retail, helps with placemaking. Need to prioritize certain businesses because they’re so strategically effective in supporting SF’s community building. One building might just need to have a childcare center?

» A lot of residents on West side being framed at anti-development. They don’t want to be trampled and pushed out because of development. The conversation around residential district concept is interesting to engage.
III. SPECIFIC SOLUTIONS

We heard specific considerations to expand existing programs or address their shortfalls.

Housing and Services for Very Low Income

- What really is going to help people is direct financial assistance. $600 has really helped people pay their rent. Rental assistance and if there is some way, unpaid rent could be deducted from property taxes.

- Section 8 vouchers don’t provide enough, need to reform as rental assistance.

- Housing retention in supportive and/or ELI housing is also an anti-displacement strategy

- Continuity of services across agencies for homeless population, coordination with SFDPH

- We need a well-funded program or department that pays special attention to the population of renters in supportive housing, on vouchers, public housing. There’s a program at Housing Rights Committee but needs significant scaling.

- The housing providers who are pushing the hardest [for evictions] are supportive housing run by non-profits and Housing Authority providers. That’s an area where the City needs to put pressure. The reason is that they don’t have the funding, resources, and training to support people so it’s easier to kick them out. They may need to work with DPH. There’s strict limitation on what other funding you can get to increase your services.

Tenant and Eviction Protections

- Need to fully fund the universal representation law. The program is making a difference

- Estimate of 1/3 of people requesting eviction defense help are served. Need for more investment.

- Need legal aid – not just formal eviction processes, but other unlawful practices (harassment, civil lawsuits, unsafe housing conditions, etc.)

Affordable Housing Availability and Eligibility

- Serious about helping low and moderate income, we need more mechanisms for affordable entry into homeownership; having people as perpetual renters is not a road to equity; ensure that low- and moderate-income households have access... accomplish a lot more equity by helping bipoc entering into homeownership

- Can we consider a point-based system for the preference programs? (length of residence, neighborhood, etc)

- build the capacity of the faith community to develop affordable housing on their land paired with equity driven development consultants

- Seeing how the lottery happens – how can we as a city assume greater responsibility and accountability to ensure BIPOC receive a greater share of BMR rentals?

- Throwing affordable units in luxury buildings does not work, especially the for-sale units. Mod-income people cannot afford those units because they don’t have enough money to pay homeowner fees.

- Maximize opportunities to implement prop E, we don’t have to rezone

- We need a source of funding for land acquisition

- Land banking program, how to we do a 10-year strategy that systemically using new sources of funding of sites, inventory of sites, dedicated funding for site acquisition

- We need more infrastructure bonds that combine transportation and affordable housing (ex. potrero housing )

- Need to figure out how we can fund medium sized sites because MOHCD is focusing on big sites (how the federal tax credits work), church parking lots, Safeway, bank parking lots
Acquisition and Preservation

- Small-sites acquisition can be an anti-displacement strategy. Large sites are more attractive financially, but it doesn’t mean that it’s advancing anti-displacement. The reason we can’t scale is money, it’s a starved program, there’s no dedicated source of funding.

- More flexible land strategy that works for smaller sites: MOHCD only wants to buy sites that are one acre or more, SOMA does not have that and the city should not shy away from purchasing smaller land parcels.

- The COPA strategy helps get properties off the speculation market.

- Allow an [inclusionary] fee-out in marina and transfer to the mission to help preserve cultural diversity in the Mission.

- Using [inclusionary] fees to pay for acquisition of motel/hotel gives more flexibility.

- SRO acquisition. Identify SROs that are past their useful life. Rehab them really seriously or actually tear them down and reimagine them as affordable housing?

- Pursue different models of ownership, cooperative business and housing ownerships

- Have temporary relocation buildings that are either city-owned or non-profit owned.

- Vacancy tax and solutions to bring vacant units back to the market

Cultural Districts

- The goal for cultural district strategies is to preserve place-based culture; a great opportunity would be to have a really strong reverse displacement component to those districts; strong housing component that would allow seniors to stay and families to come back

- Different aspects of Cultural Districts need funding such as community planning work so that we can engage in a more meaningful way; grow land use capacity and strategies, try to build out acquisition of existing buildings; need to be funded and with commitment from the city that these will be strategies that need to be taken; a lot of capacity-building is a strong part of it and support for existing work that is happening

- Look at cultural district, implement things that could stabilize the community as opposed to asking for benefits from each development individually.

Speculation

- Housing providers who have pledged to protect the most vulnerable tenant are the ones evicting people right now. Nonprofits are doing the evictions. This is also speculative.

- Better understand the ownership structure on who’s owning the properties as well as more timely data on flipping, need for rental registry

- Data and registry that’s important, use what we’re doing Covid19 data collection as a model, we need demographics and who lives where and how many units in a building

- Subscribe to newsletters with realtors to get the trends, they understand the market and share their understanding, with the end of the eviction moratorium, speculators for mom and pop owners trying to offload properties

- Speculation, much larger inventory of for sale is coming up, and rents are coming down, with big influx of properties on the market it opens the door on speculation, because they hope for bigger profits long-term.

- We should talk about low income homeowner retention at some point too. Financial distress may force some folks to sell

- Stabilize landlords of color, low-income and immigrants to prevent their rental properties to be moved into a tier of large investor owned landlords.
• Landlord education on how to manage properties, esp. smaller mom-and-pop businesses, or non-local owners unfamiliar with our rules

• Think holistically about how policies like upzoning can increase speculation and negative effects on communities.

• The way government works, its always behind the market. Even if we create a program to adjust to the speculation market, it will always be behind. Trying to time things with the speculative market is extremely difficult. Even developers can’t time the market.

MISC

• SF has really bad soil conditions, outer lands is the worst soil. Don’t want to put the housing all the way to the ocean. It’s cost-prohibitive to do the subgrade work.

• Community Land Trusts need to be explored

• How dense can we make these different locations based on the structure? Planning needs to work with DBI.

• Think more broadly of the lifecycle of housing; residential care is disappearing cause we do not think of it like housing; make sure it is available in the neighborhood and that it is affordable

• Laurel heights development now on 4th year of peer-review. This should be a time-limited experience. We need to be efficient about the process and make it predictable. Need consistency that reduces risk, allows us to go faster, allows us to still be communicative. Associated costs when rules are not predictable.

Neighborhood Improvements

• Prioritizing green spaces. How we are cultivating open space in historically marginalized communities is extremely important to consider.

• In the Mission, we are letting new market rate development encroach on existing public space. 1) what do we do to create new open space and 2) how do we prioritize existing open space? Need to create a community-based planning process so BIPOC communities can exercise self-determination when it comes to increasing open space

• The City needs to develop a bottom up way to identify priorities – and the immediate issue might not be open space, it might be food/housing. The people need to be involved in the process of setting priorities, they need to be in control of the process and we need to step back and then we step up to ensure priorities are implemented for the people that live there.

• Plan for stabilizing of housing and community institutions and small businesses. Every neighborhood should get a plan regardless if they want to upzoning. Don’t want to be in a situation in neighborhoods that don’t see development don’t get improvements – don’t tie too closely.

• Using the ground floor for community needs (i.e small businesses). Developers says they can’t find anyone to rent the space. Can it be part of the community benefits package to have ground floor retail to be reserved for community space. Ground floor sets the tone and expectation to say that the building is for existing residents or “new people.”

• We need to be mindful about our green spaces and how we’re cultivating those in marginalized and underserved communities, especially thinking about ways to create more gardens. This could be an option or something to consider.

• Idea of 10-minute neighborhoods where everything you need in daily life is within 10 minute walk of your home. Complementary vision is 30-minute city where the rest of what you need is within 30 minutes via transit from your home.

• There’s often a very big lag in implementation of community plans. Keeping faith with those communities, if they give their time to these plans, there needs to be prompt action.

• Every neighborhood does deserve a plan and ideas of what the needs and strengths of every neighborhood are. But how do you do that without misleading the community about what can actually happen.
• We should do neighborhood plans looking at the available sites and ensure that 30 to 40 percent of units are designated as affordable.

• Neighborhood planning is important. At the development project level, how do those buildings contribute to the larger neighborhood and enhance community-wide health? The balance is making sure development can still pencil

IV. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS
HPG group members provided constructive insight on how to pursue outreach and how to elevate the voices not often heard. While we didn’t talk a lot about metrics of evaluating progress, some HPG members started the conversation.

• Take the lead from communities and invest in community-based planning. Allow them to come up with their own plans and identify their own priorities

• Need to come to our communities. Go to our community events.

• In-language outreach

• Accountability is placed on the shoulder of the folks working in the community, that we must be at city hall and planning commission and reminding the city and the department to do the work; we absolutely need more funding for folks in the community to do the planning work, investing in the community and allow the folks who are there to tell you what is going on; to know that the community doesn’t feel alone “the planning department has our back” they have these framework and goals and they have our back

• Working with CDC orgs that represent cultural aspects and physically represent the residents that are being served. Who are the people that are advocating. Messaging from the orgs need to be very specific to the residents they serve. Need to have funding for that messaging and narrative effort

• The City doesn’t do participatory planning well. By the time community input happens, the property has been purchased and entitled. It’s a check-the-box kind of approach. At that point, key decisions have been made. City/Developers are looking for buy-in. Need to actually be listening to what communities are saying.

• Creating space and empowering underserved communities so they can create the determination of what community resources they need, how those should be prioritized and how we can collaborate with those people to make sure that they’re the leaders in the process.

• Good process starts with identifying who are the organizations that are working with working class BIPOC people.

V. METRICS
• Metrics could use a social determinants of health lens (e.g. SB1000 required topics) - policymaking needs to be approached in a way that is accessible to community. Not just housing, but services, access to health care, food, etc.

• Metrics need to show benefits for Low-income/BIPOC residents

Phase I Round 2 Meetings in December 2020
In December of 2020 the Planning Department reconvened three Housing Policy Group meetings focused on deeper discussions of issues that were identified in the summer HPG meetings.

The three focus areas were:
• TOPIC 1 - What are the priority investments in community stabilization programs for Black, American-Indian, and other people of color and to address segregated geographies/poverty concentration?

• TOPIC 2- Investing in more affordable housing in High-resourced neighborhoods and affordable housing strategies in Disadvantaged Communities

• TOPIC 3- Potential strategies to support the private sector to produce small multifamily housing for middle-income households
VI. PRIORITY INVESTMENTS FOR BIPOC COMMUNITIES AND TO ADDRESS SEGREGATION

Participants had concrete ideas about how the city could center racial equity by prioritizing investment in Black, American-Indian and People of Color communities and address segregated geographies and poverty concentration.

A. If we were to focus anti-displacement efforts on certain high-risk communities, which ones, how would we define the target? (Geography, BIPOC, Black and American-Indian, Low-Income)

HPG Stakeholders generally all agreed that the city should continue efforts to target housing resources to Black, American-Indian, Latino and other communities of color that have disproportionately faced displacement in recent years. There was no clear consensus about how exactly to define that targeting. Some favored using ‘sensitive communities’ maps to identify neighborhoods most at risk while others favored explicit preferences based on household race.

- Consider the following approach: centering American Indian and Black communities first, and then by geographies looking for overlap.

- We should use the Sensitive Communities Map (UC Berkeley + MEDA + Community folks) and not reduce the metric to just race. We should include other factors.

- Households income by race and ethnicity, the Black population has experienced the most displacement and has the lowest income. They need the most attention in terms of funding and opportunities.

- There is a need to address and look at historic displacement patterns and how they mirror current displacement patterns. Planning Department’s growth-oriented approach has led to displacement everywhere.

- Consider how the policies might prevent preferences for certain kinds of housing and other land use. A fundamental examination of the policies, such as fair housing laws that might prevent certain preferences. This impedes the ability to provide housing for those that are most at risk.

- Instead of mitigation strategies, we would like to see frameworks that are Equity First - put forward policies that are predicated on not harming communities (vs. mitigating)

- We should look at the different mechanisms of displacement and how they affect particular communities differently.

- Look at median income of different groups. It is critical to understand and target the median incomes.

- Use a targeted universalism framework centering the most impacted here to generate the deepest change for everyone.

B. Would it be possible to identify the top most effective programs for this goal?

While few stakeholders were willing to name one program that was currently the most effective in preventing or reversing displacement, the small sites program, inclusionary housing program, affordable housing resident selection preferences and rental assistance programs were most frequently mentioned in these discussions. Most of the discussion, however, was focused on how these programs could be refined to better achieve this goal.

Small Sites Program

- In terms of non-profit community stewardship, Small Sites has been very effective in preventing displacement

- If a building is rent-controlled, people may lose those benefits through the Small Sites program, we need to address this

- Small sites needs to be resourced to get to the scale that it needs to be, needs to deal with AMI levels and look at income levels by race
**Inclusionary Housing Program**

» We should be decoupling affordable housing from market rate; moving away from the income criteria as it is a limiting factor; expanding inventory of land (public, non-profit, community stewardship)

» [we should focus on] lower AMIs, larger units for families

**Housing Preferences**

» Is there a way to revisit preferences to make sure they are serving those who we want to be benefiting (e.g. could preference for homeownership go to affordable housing residents in order to free up a rental unit for another family)

» The structure of preferences hasn’t been working; they need to be extended and expanded, they have significant barriers - but unfortunately community is blamed for not making use of them vs looking at the barriers

**Rental Assistance**

» Rental assistance for people who have been living here their whole lives should be a priority

» Any people that are unhoused, they need to be a priority. That is just a given.

**Other Needs**

» Support community-led efforts at Planning rather than top-down. Communities that are impacted know best. Rental assistance, eviction assistance, small sites program is underfunded and is building capacity in communities.

» Before the pandemic there was a different need than now. There is a lack of language capacity/ support in rental assistance programs before pandemic and during.

» 3 Ps - (order is important) Protection for people, preservation of existing housing, production of new housing.

» Once people are unhoused, but not on the street they are ineligible for the programs available (create a spectrum).

» Support for land trusts/co-ops and alternative homeownership models

**C. If we wanted to reverse displacement, how would that be done, would it be possible?**

While everyone agreed that reversing displacement was important, some questioned whether it was the right goal for San Francisco. Some felt that, given that displacement was ongoing and that City policies were still contributing to displacement it would be better to state a goal of stopping displacement. Others felt that it was important for the city to commit to the more ambitious vision of reversing displacement. There were, however, only a limited number of concrete suggestions for how to achieve this. Many participants made process suggestions mostly related to ways that the city could more effectively engage the communities that have been experiencing displacement in leadership on combatting the problem and some had suggestions for better data collection to help target solutions. One policy area that was mentioned repeatedly related to reversing displacement was homeownership.

**Understanding the Needs**

» The City should ask impacted community members what are the neighborhoods that people would like to have access to?

» There is frustration with missing data and the inability of policy to solve this problem. The City needs to fund communities to work on CHESS reports/Cultural District and be able to tell City/Policy makers what they need. If you were to house all unhoused Native Americans in the Bay Area, population would increase 10%

» Need to synch up on definition of displacement. It’s not just evictions. It is economic displacement. It is doable to measure. Leads to how we provide the resources to center by the communities to fight displacement of the communities.
Years of residency should be an important element in prioritizing for antidisplacement.

Homeownership

Promoting homeownership can be an offensive tactic to reverse displacement. The City can actively make repairs for what has been taken. HOPESF is seen as a reparations framework and restorative framework for this kind of thing.

Rent-to-buy structures are seen as beneficial for the American Indian community.

Create limited equity models for ownership.

Investing in HO is like dropping a pebble in a lake; it’s an expensive endeavor, but this is a part of the longer term; invest in the generational wealth of a family; we need these types of solutions.

It is important that the assistance (for homeownership, for example) are grants and not loans, especially as we focus on Black and American Indian populations.

It should be a priority to bring back the Black community. Ownership in the Fillmore is gone because people were pushed out.

VII. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

This section summarizes comments regarding the City’s approach to investing in more affordable housing in High-resourced neighborhoods and affordable housing strategies in Disadvantaged Communities.

A. How could we adjust strategies to increase affordable housing in High-Resourced Neighborhoods? How should those be different than our strategies in Disadvantaged Communities?

While some people questioned the language of ‘high resource neighborhoods,’ stakeholders generally felt that it was appropriate for the City to increase its efforts to locate affordable housing in neighborhoods that have historically not included much affordable housing and agreed that doing so would require new strategies and techniques. Many participants stressed the importance of including communities in the process – both in the creation of maps or boundaries and in the crafting of neighborhood level affordable housing strategies.

There are concerns about focusing on access to high resource schools, what about the rest of the schools?

What is being considered a high-resource neighborhood? It seems like biased language. The Mission is a high-resourced neighborhood, but someone not in the Mission may not know that since they don’t know where the resources are. We shouldn’t be pitting two areas of the city against one another and we should be looking at building affordable housing overall.

The City should not be creating maps and imposing them on communities. The DPH map should be done with the community and require community approval, map lacks a nuance that can only be found with the community.

Maps should reflect opportunities for children (access to high opportunity schools) vs everyone else. Sorting by age is one way to modify the map to who will be housed.

One approach could be increased streamlining/less opportunity to oppose projects in areas that have not historically welcomed affordable housing.

We need to do a better job on how outreach is being done for affordable housing in different neighborhoods. Seems like red-lining is still going on. I see a lot of affordable housing but not a lot of African-Americans in those neighborhoods. Not sure if that’s an outreach issue, former redlining, or other issue that is causing that to happen.

Our organizations that have been the mainstay of affordable housing are also primarily concentrated in certain neighborhoods of the city (may
be historical logic to that) so as we think about other neighborhoods, there’s also a capacity building question with our orgs to stretch services farther geographically or planting seeds for new orgs to grow.

» We shouldn’t assume that everyone wants to move to high resource neighborhoods. For immigrants, cultural fabric is very important. In certain neighborhoods, immigrants can’t get the right groceries, for example.

» ADUs seem to be a good strategy for higher opportunity neighborhoods. What incentives can be made? Sometimes there is less pushback for ADUs.

B. How should we shift our affordable housing strategies in Disadvantaged Communities to stabilize communities of color?

At the same time, most participants also agreed that the City should continue to invest in expanding affordable housing opportunities in the neighborhoods where most of the affordable units are currently concentrated. Several stakeholders stressed the need for more investment in capacity building for community-led organizations with strong ties to impacted communities. Others pointed to a need for better data about who is being served by existing housing strategies.

» We should focus on citywide strategies with neighborhood level nuance.

» It would be helpful to understand who needs housing and doesn’t have sufficient access to that now. We have very rigid ways of creating housing and we either fit that bucket or not. People are unable to qualify for any housing units, and on the other side there are also folks who can’t get into the low-income units that have been built. We need to think about both increasing middle income opportunities and also not losing low-income.

» Build capacity in affordable housing development and housing services among CBOs that have historical relationships to the communities where they work, local competency and relatability for a consolidated and efficient approach.

» Black-led organizations are being left out of the mix altogether. We need a venue created for this conversation to happen.

» I do think that we oftentimes run into this perception that outreach is the whole of the problem. I want to point out that there’s lots of barriers and things within the programs themselves. I don’t want to look at just outreach, we need to look at income requirements of affordable housing programs and pull out pieces of where those programs might be limiting access for communities.

» Tap into existing and trusted community resources to provide holistic and consolidated housing services.

» Our question is, when we have disproportionate pools of applicants based on the income level - that’s a huge barrier. People with higher incomes are getting better odds. MOHCD needs better data on who is getting selected for units and compare that to who is coming through the rental applications, etc. What I’m not seeing is a proportional relationship where anyone has said this % of our properties need to be for this income range based on the residents that are here.

» We need a mandate from the city specifying the number of affordable units in each neighborhood over next 5-10 years. Then we can work with each community to figure out where those units go.

C. Could more streamlining for projects with affordable housing help bring more affordable units? What are the disadvantages?

Participants were somewhat split on the benefits of efforts to streamline and remove delays in the process of review and approval of new affordable housing projects. Some felt that the city should do everything in its power to remove any and all hurdles including public hearings and review for any project including a share of affordable units.
Others felt that 100% affordable projects should be streamlined but projects including market rate units should be subject to more review and community input.

» **Timelines really have a big effect on how much affordable housing we can develop. Increased timeline -> increased cost of development.**

» **Consider equity concerns when streamlining, moving to discretionary reviews, etc. to avoid harm to the communities.**

» **Permanently affordable units should be exempt from density limits, without CU, in every zoning district.**

» **That’s a question that depends on the project being proposed. We need to be specific about that, otherwise community is unable to make an informed decision as to whether the project will have 0 inequitable impact upon the community. Or whether the streamlining itself presents a danger.**

» **We should definitely go as far as possible for 100% affordable projects and I believe we would support streamlining for any multifamily projects meeting (or slightly exceeding) their inclusionary requirements, particularly in high resource areas that have historically succeeded in thwarting new housing.**

VIII. MIDDLE INCOME HOUSING

We also asked about housing strategies to serve middle-income households including development of smaller multi-family housing buildings.

A. Do we need incentives for small to mid-size development to be less expensive to offer housing choices to the middle-income households? What are some of those incentives?

Many stakeholders were able to identify specific incentives which could help encourage development of smaller projects including projects that were priced to serve more moderate income households. Most commonly mentioned were reductions in the level of impact fees, reductions in affordable housing requirements and streamlining of the approvals process. Most seemed to agree that direct affordable housing subsidy should be reserved for lower-income housing and not used to underwrite middle-income housing.

» **The planning process is painfully long. I cannot see myself going through that again, and it was [for a project] with 0 opposition. You want to make a profit, but it’s so difficult to get through the process.**

» **Recognize that constraints to development include the slowness/"problem" of the planning review and City permitting process itself.**

» **Incentives help getting attention from developers. What might work better that the process expectation is more realistic and standard. If developer is proposing a fully code-compliant building, that there is some assurance to move in a timely pace.**

» **To facilitate missing middle: make the process take less time, reduce the fees (including inclusionary fees), create zoning opportunities for these. As you move the levers, feasibility improves.**

» **Benefits from missing middle are long-term benefits. Short-term benefits should be left to those doing the financial undertaking.**

» **Missing Middle: Impact fees: fully or partially exempt inclusionary for buildings with less than 20 units or make it dependent on the sale of the unit.**

B. How do we ensure that the units really serve middle-income people?

There were mixed opinions about whether new housing in smaller infill buildings would tend to be less expensive than most of the new housing currently being built. Some felt strongly that if the City were to expand the zoning and provide other incentives that enough new housing could be build that it would bring the prices/rents down noticeably. Others felt that the market demand
was so strong that any new housing would be far too expensive for even middle-income families. Some felt that it would be possible for the city to tie incentives to requirements that some or all of the new units in these buildings be sold or rented to qualified middle income residents.

» Market rents are always going to be the maximum amount that people are willing to pay; simply lowering cost will not reduce rent prices.

» Market rate housing is a good thing. Its not the only fix in San Francisco, we need State and federal investment as well. Even if in San Francisco we said we'll incentivize as much Market Rate with affordable, and no one else in the region does, this will not get solved.

» The cost of construction is a huge problem, Home SF at 20-25% affordable is a little tougher to digest, but it allows more units and smaller units and smaller units are worth more per foot for a developer so it's a huge benefit. For people who've been around a long time it's a shock because home SF doesn't allow parking, so it's a little tough to digest for the neighbors.

» How do we basically say, you don't get those carrots if your end product isn't affordable.

» For missing middle, we may need a more rigid government parameter on the expectations of what is built.

» Now there's not enough competition among contractors compared to 2008. This is a lack of economic development policy in SF for and region wide of how to both increase the labor pool in construction and the construction capacity, which seems to be diminishing every year, there are lot less subcontractors...a lot less people interested in doing construction work and that's an existential question for development.

» Habitat for Humanity functions as a bank, and funds downpayment with sweat equity, this model can be leveraged into more units.

» SB 1097 would have allowed SF to purchase corporate owned property not occupied within 90 days and be used for affordable housing through land trust, legislation can be used for these changes.

» The city thinks about what you can control, so we focus a lot on the process and trying to make the process faster. Appreciate getting to the next question, if there's going to be something that's a subsidy, making sure you get something from the affordability, but in order to get there you need to reduce the costs. Maybe it's not about incentives, but more about making small and mid-size feasible to actually offer middle income housing.

C. What other benefits should the small multi-family buildings offer to serve the existing communities?

Stakeholders had a few additional ideas for community benefits that could be tied to the provision of small multi-family buildings but most seemed to feel that affordable housing was the most important benefit to focus on at this point.

» More property taxes

» There has to be some affordability outcome that drives missing middle, that is the only reason that makes it worthwhile to throw carrots at it, if that works you get a bunch of other things that come with it too.

» We've created a culture of negotiation that feeds into this system and that has created a dynamic of questioning market rate development.

» Home SF project has been around for 3 years, many people still don't know about it. I'm doing a few Home SF projects and when it comes forward, people are shocked, maybe more neighborhood outreach would be helpful.
D. Other suggestions:

Stakeholders also had concrete suggestions on a number of other topics.

» I’m interested in the idea of having developers build scattered affordable projects if there is potential there

» Impact fees on storefront commercial could be waived if the builder leases for 20+ years to a legacy business. Or a community institution. Same with residential impact fees - could the fees be adjusted to create ‘policy discounts’ for projects that deliver certain public benefits?

» I just hope black brown and all POC with disabilities including mental health are given opportunities for permanent housing in these new strategies. I don’t see specific language around this. And at times when mentioned it is handed off as the responsibility of other departments.

» We work to support our POC communities, we want to highlight that our API communities are also at risk of displacement. Close to half have stated that they have zero income, and due to language barrier, many do not know how to seek help or find available resources, so we’re hoping to see changes in the Planning Dept and to find out what the needs of these communities are. For example, for Chinese immigrant population language barriers have been a key challenge.

» Staff in mixed-income buildings sometimes treat lower income immigrants differently from wealthier neighbors. Not enough staff with language competency. Staff treat them poorly. This makes people very depressed. I don’t think that this is a good idea. I understand the funding constraints. I don’t think that this model is helping low income tenants.

» The City is still oriented around office development. Need data driven analysis of how development plans are looked at in the Planning Department. We need a racial equity lens to be the way development is looked at and improved.

II.V. How Input Will Define Draft Goals, Policies and Actions

As shared above, Phase 1 focused on gathering input from San Francisco residents, community members, and the Housing Policy Group on housing needs, challenges and opportunities. Based on this input, a synthesis was prepared. Using this synthesis and informed by the Housing Element 2022 Update draft Needs Assessment, project staff drafted goals, policies and actions that incorporated public input prioritizing advancing racial and social equity and balancing the different and sometimes competing community needs. From there, project staff coordinated an interagency review. The resulting draft goals, policies and actions will be released at the beginning of Phase II of outreach and engagement.
II.6 How Input Will Define Draft Goals, Policies and Actions

The summary and synthesis shared in this document directly informed the first draft of goals, policies, and actions. Based on community values, particularly advancing racial and social equity, project staff drafted goals policies and actions balancing the different and sometimes competing community needs. This draft was also informed by the draft Housing Needs Assessment, as well as interagency review to ensure buy-in from various City agencies that run various housing programs or related community resources. Below you can find which goals and policies address each of the public input summary themes. Many of these themes will also be available as a sorting topic in the Department's forthcoming sortable tool to review draft policies and actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Input Theme</th>
<th>Draft goals, policies, and actions that incorporate this input *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial Equity</td>
<td>I.10, Goal II, III, VI and all their underlying policies and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Goal I and all underlying policies and actions, II.4, V.1, V.2, V.3, V1.3, VI.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>II.6, VI.2, VI.3, VI.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Engagement</td>
<td>II.2, II.3, II.4, III.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Protections and Community stabilization</td>
<td>I.5, I.6, I.7, I.8, I.9, I.10, I.11, II.5, III.1, III.2, III.3, VI.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership and Economic Mobility</td>
<td>II.5, III.4, IV.6, V.3, V.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently affordable housing Production</td>
<td>IV.1, III.8, IV.3, IV.4, IV.5, V.1, V.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Affordable Housing Access and Eligibility</td>
<td>I.10, I.11, III.1, III.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Housing and Supportive Services</td>
<td>I.1, I.2, I.3, I.4, I.5, I.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving Affordability and Improving Conditions of Existing Housing</td>
<td>II.6, I.8, III.3, IV.9, VI.4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Production</td>
<td>III.1, III.5, III.6, III.7, III.8; Goal IV and all underlying policies and actions; V.3, V.4, V.6, VI.2, VI.3, VI.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Choice as Household Size and needs change</td>
<td>III.6, III.7; Goal V and all underlying policies and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Opportunity and Redressing Divestment in Priority Geographies</td>
<td>Goals II and III and all underlying policies and actions; VI.3, VI.4; VI.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Opportunity Neighborhoods</td>
<td>III.5, III.6, III.7, III.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Find these policies on our website: https://sfhousingelement.org/first-draft-plan
III. Lessons Learned and Next Steps

The COVID-19 pandemic greatly impacted and shaped how the Planning Department conducted outreach and engagement for Phase 1. The inability of the Department to safely reach residents in their neighborhoods and the digital divide between different communities made outreach and engagement difficult. Project staff had to constantly readjust strategies to reach and engage communities of color, low-income communities, and vulnerable groups. This experience left project staff with important lessons learned for upcoming phases of outreach and engagement:

- In order to advance racial and social equity, outreach and engagement plans must remain flexible to adjust to community needs, especially during a global pandemic; these adjustments may involve the creation of new engagement tools based on community input, as well as being able to receive input at any given time despite structured phases of outreach and engagement.

- Partnerships with community-based organizations (CBOs) representing American Indian, Black, and other communities of color, as well as low-income communities are essential for reaching these communities. Communities of color and low-income communities may already be engaging with the CBOs at recurring meetings, so when the Planning Department can respectfully come to these spaces when invited it eases the burden of participation for them. Additionally, during the COVID-19 pandemic, a lot of CBOs did capacity building with community members on how to participate online and some of them had been having conversations around housing issues, both of which greatly improved the Planning Department’s ability to engage with those community members.

- Presence on the ground is still the best choice to address the digital divide for some of our residents, so partnering with CBOs that were providing in-person services during the pandemic made a significant difference in the diversity of input the Housing Element team received.

- In-language events were crucial to gather input from immigrant populations. These events must include presentations and facilitation in-language with interpretation available for questions to the Planning Department staff.

- the Planning Department needs to improve content accessibility, especially given that housing topics are full of technical language. The Department also needs to increase funding to compensate CBOs that collaborate with the Department in vetting, designing, and/or implementing outreach and engagement strategies, co-designing meeting and focus groups. Participants should also be compensated for their time and effort.

- The Housing Element 2022 Update is a citywide document; thus, the Department needs to continue to address competing priorities, trade-offs, and contradictions in upcoming phases of outreach and engagement.

Next steps include the release of the draft goals, policies and actions and kicking off Phase II of community engagement when the Department will once again enlist the participation of residents, community members, the Housing Policy Group, and HEARD. The Planning Department will be requesting that participants review and share input on the first draft of policies so that they may be refined in Fall 2021. At the same time, the Planning Department will be
kicking off the Environmental Review Public Process, which a goal of publishing the Draft Environment Impact Report in early 2022.

Phase II outreach and engagement for San Francisco’s residents and community members will likely involve focus groups with residents representing different communities of color, vulnerable groups, and geographies; some will address specific topics (e.g. homelessness and supportive services). This phase will also include an updated digital participation platform where the public will be able to review and share comment online on the draft goals, policies, and actions. Finally, there will be public hearings at different commissions to ensure the general public can provide input.

The Housing Element 2022 Update will continue to engage the Housing Policy Group through small conversations based on expertise and will enlist members to review and comment on the draft goals, policies, and actions. Finally, Phase II will also enlist the support of the newly created the Planning Department Equity Advisory Council to help review the draft Housing Element.
Appendices
Appendix A: Survey Results

How effective would each of the solutions below be in addressing your housing challenges?

1. Racial and Social Equity:
To reverse the long-term impact of discriminatory housing policies that led to disparate health and economic outcomes for communities of color, we could...

1A. Offer priorities to American Indian, Black, Latinx and other vulnerable communities of color for housing programs and access.

1B. Prioritize low-income neighborhoods living in poor quality environments for improvements to public amenities (schools, parks, public transit, open spaces, pedestrian safety, health care, etc.)

1C. Ensure affordable housing units are built equitably throughout the city instead of being concentrated on just the east and southeast sides.

---

**Section 1A**
- Very Effective: 49%
- Somewhat Effective: 25%
- Not Effective: 18%
- Do Not Know: 8%

**Section 1B**
- Very Effective: 61%
- Somewhat Effective: 9%
- Not Effective: 3%
- Do Not Know: 9%

**Section 1C**
- Very Effective: 62%
- Somewhat Effective: 28%
- Not Effective: 5%
- Do Not Know: 10%
2. Housing Security:
To prevent displacement of San Francisco residents and address homelessness, we could...

2A. Expand tenant protections including eviction protections, legal services, local preference programs and rental assistance.

2B. Expand programs that prioritize housing and support to tenants who are evicted through no fault of their own (e.g. move-in of the landlord, demolition, significant home improvements, etc.)

2C. Increase rental assistance to prevent evictions due to nonpayment of rent.

2D. Subsidize housing for eligible middle-income households such as teachers, nurses, and first responders.

2E. Increase the capacity of and build more homeless shelters throughout the city.

2F. Expand permanent supportive housing for people and families experiencing homelessness.
3. Affordability:  
To preserve affordability of existing housing, we could...

3A. Tax and regulate the rapid resale of residential homes for extracting high profit particularly through evicting long-time tenants.

3B. Tax residential units that are kept vacant for long periods of time.

3C. Acquire and convert more rent-controlled buildings to permanently price-controlled housing for low- to moderate-income households.

3D. Support leasing and acquiring SROs (single room occupancy housing) by nonprofits and the city.

3E. Incentivize and allow for building more ADUs (e.g. in-law units, granny flats).

3F. Provide financial loans to low-income homeowners to encourage legalizing in-law units built without permits.
4. Building More Housing:
To ensure we build different types of housing for all types of households, including affordable housing, we could...

4A. Require a mix of multi-bedroom units and child-friendly amenities in new buildings to promote housing for families.

4B. Create zoning changes that would allow for more housing within the eastern parts of the city (Downtown, Mission, SOMA, Bayview, etc.).

4C. Create zoning changes that allow for small multi-unit apartments in low density residential neighborhoods.

4D. Create zoning changes that would allow for more housing along transit corridors in the west side of the city along transit corridors (Richmond, Sunset, Parkside, West Portal, City College, etc.).

4E. Build affordable housing on underutilized publicly-owned land to reduce costs along with market-rate housing to help finance higher numbers of affordable units.

4F. Secure new funding sources such as bonds for affordable housing.

4G. Encourage a variety of housing types in all neighborhoods that offer amenities for seniors, children, people with disabilities, etc.

4H. Make it easier for certain housing types to get approved to be built, e.g. buildings with more affordable units than required or smaller multi-unit buildings (4–15 units) that offer lower rent/prices.

4I. Create training programs to expand the supply of skilled construction workers.

4J. Use new construction methods and materials such as modular housing (housing that is built in a factory environment and assembled at the construction site) to reduce costs.
5. Sustainability, Climate Resilience, Livability:
To make existing and future housing sustainable, climate resilient, and livable, we could...

5A. Direct new multi-family housing units, especially affordable housing, near public transit to accommodate transit improvement investments.

5B. Encourage walking and biking by including retail shops, grocery stores, restaurants, childcare, community centers, health facilities, etc. on the ground floor of new residential buildings.

5C. Ensure new housing in areas vulnerable to flooding is built to be safe from floods and storms and provide open space and amenities to improve neighborhood resilience as well.

5D. Prioritize financing programs for building retrofits in communities most vulnerable to sea level rise and flooding, and other climate change impacts such as extreme heat, air quality issues due to wildfire.

5E. Conserve historic architecture, landmarks, and cultural heritage within our neighborhoods.

5F. Plan for parks, schools, libraries, transit, and pedestrian safety within neighborhoods as the city’s population grows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Do Not Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Executive Summary

What is this report?

The San Francisco Planning Department is preparing an update to the Housing Element of the city’s General Plan, scheduled for adoption by the Board of Supervisors in January 2023. The Housing Element 2022 Update (2022 Update) is San Francisco’s housing plan for the next 8 years (2023-2030) and the first one that will center racial and social equity. It will include policies and programs that express the city’s collective vision and values for the future of housing in San Francisco.

The following report summarizes public input on the first draft of the 2022 Update during Phase II of outreach and engagement, which occurred between April and September 2021. The report also demonstrates how the draft policies have been revised to reflect the community’s input.

How was the public engaged?

SF Planning staff presented the first draft of policies through a variety of approaches intended to elevate the voices of communities of color and other marginalized groups. The main approach was working with community-based organizations to design and lead 22 focus groups. The target participants for the focus groups were residents from the city’s communities of color and other populations vulnerable to housing instability. In addition, staff participated in 25 community conversations hosted by a variety of organizations and led a series of discussions with a group of housing policy experts from the community. Staff met several times with SF Planning’s Community Equity Advisory Council and sought feedback at public hearings with the Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, and Human Rights Commission. Lastly, staff connected with additional stakeholders through meetings, interviews, emails, and the project website.
What did the public say?

Public input over the six-month period was extensive and wide-ranging, made evident in the summaries of input staff received from each outreach venue. Staff found that there was considerable alignment amongst various participants about what needs to be done to address San Francisco’s housing crisis.

The following list seeks to articulate the community directives that came from this large body of input to identify what the City is being asked to do:

1. Restructure how resources are prioritized for residents suffering the greatest burden of vulnerabilities and those harmed and/or displaced by discriminatory government actions.

2. Improve access to existing housing programs and financial resources through increased human contact, cultural humility, navigability, and educational outreach, and by creating alternatives to existing forms of means testing.

3. Ensure dignified housing for current and displaced residents free from discrimination, overcrowding or substandard conditions, and with access to chosen community, cultural anchors, services and jobs.

4. Promote the equitable distribution of housing across all parts of the city through increased public funding, rezoning, education, incentives and streamlining measures while ensuring that projects do not displace existing residents.

5. Increase wealth building opportunities through homeownership, financial education, and job training for American Indian, Black and lower income residents.

6. Build the kind of housing that vulnerable communities want in their neighborhoods so that they have opportunities to stay connected to their history and culture.

7. Create accountability in policy making and empower residents to share decision-making for housing programs and project approvals.

8. Further study the equity impacts of market-rate housing production on American Indian, Black and other communities of color and vulnerable residents, and apply those findings to stop the displacement of these groups.

What is the effect of this public input?

SF Planning has revised the draft 2022 Update to respond to the community directives distilled from this phase of engagement. Each directive is addressed by a goal, objective, policy and/or action within the revised draft. While many directives affirmed ideas shared in the first draft, substantial changes were made to the 2022 Update to bolster and refine the policies. The main shifts in policy are listed below:

- Added more explicit reparative framing to policies intended to redress discriminatory government actions.
- Incorporated truth-telling processes led by harmed communities to guide reparative actions.
- Increased the number of actions related in improving transparency and accountability in housing distribution and management systems.
- Strengthened policies intended to increase the quality, variety and distribution of affordable housing available to vulnerable populations such as seniors, people with disabilities, LGBTQ+ people, transitional aged youth, immigrants, and others.
- Bolstered policies intended to deliver small and midrise multi-family buildings that can serve middle-income households.
- Incorporated stronger actions to study and eliminate displacement.

How will this information be shared?

The information and findings of this report will be shared via public hearings in early 2022, the Housing Element website, and continued engagement with community partners and stakeholders in a series of focus groups and meetings prior to March 2022.
Manilatown Focus Group. Photo by incommon LLC.
The Housing Element 2022 Update (2022 Update) is San Francisco’s housing plan for the next 8 years (2023-2030) and the first one that will center racial and social equity. It will include policies and programs that express our collective vision and values for the future of housing in San Francisco. This update will determine what our housing needs are and how we will work to address them, defining priorities for decision making and resource allocation for housing programs, development, and services.

Within the last decade San Francisco has gone through an economic boom and affordability crisis, a global public health crisis and economic downturn, as well as a national racial reckoning, all of which have played a part in shaping the outreach and engagement process for the city’s next housing plan. The 2022 Update relies on an extensive and robust outreach and engagement effort to ensure our housing plan reflects current housing needs, priorities, and values of our communities, particularly of our communities of color and other vulnerable communities. The following analysis summarizes input from Phase II of these efforts and describes how the draft 2022 Update will be revised to reflect the community’s directives for housing policy and actions.
Community Engagement Process

The engagement process for the 2022 Update incorporates three phases of outreach and engagement. After vetting key ideas with the community in Phase I, the project team reviewed draft housing policy and related actions with residents, community and government leaders, and housing experts and advocates in Phase II. The greater part of outreach and engagement occurred in a first round of draft policy review, which will be followed by a second shorter round of engagement (Phase III) to demonstrate with this report how community input is reflected in revised policy and to further refine critical ideas such as a reparative framework for housing. The second round of outreach in early 2022 will primarily seek to validate the findings of this report and to further develop critical policies. Phase III will conclude with publication of the third draft of the 2022 Update in March. Outreach afterwards will focus on sharing information about the draft 2022 Update content and adoption process and facilitating discussions with community and government leaders to prepare for its implementation.

Figure 1. Housing Element 2022 Update Community Engagement Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Intent</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning from Past Efforts</td>
<td>Gather and summarize key policy ideas from past efforts related to housing and community development</td>
<td>Public announcement through an informational public hearing, website, email, and social media</td>
<td>Draft key policy ideas to share with the public for feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Vetting Key Ideas with the Community</td>
<td>Ask the community to reflect on the draft key policy ideas and share their housing needs, challenges, and opportunities to inform the first draft of policy updates.</td>
<td>Website, video promotion, traditional media, phone, mail, social media, email blasts, presentations, listening sessions, surveys, and digital participation platform</td>
<td>First draft of policy updates based on input shared by the community (Events modified for public health safety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Refining Policies Together</td>
<td>Ask the community to reflect on the draft policy updates</td>
<td>Two rounds of outreach including focus groups, public hearings, and digital participation platform</td>
<td>Second and third drafts of policy updates based on input shared by the community (Events modified for public health safety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III Moving Towards Adoption</td>
<td>Seek approval of the Housing Element 2022 Update based on the third draft from elected officials and State Agency</td>
<td>Public hearings with the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Adopted update to the Housing Element in compliance with State Law (Events subject to change due to the COVID-19 pandemic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principles for Outreach and Engagement

The following principles guide all outreach and engagement for the Housing Element 2022 Update process:

**Inclusive representation**
Engage San Franciscans representing a range of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, age, abilities, housing type and tenure.

**Meaningful contribution**
Ensure each step of outreach has a clear intent and outcome, including how input will be incorporated.

**Access to information and participation**
Use a variety of online and in-person platforms for participation scheduled at times, locations, and in languages accessible to different households. In-person events will be ADA-accessible.1

**Transparent communication**
Maintain an updated website to document information and feedback gathered and use variety of methods to notify communities about upcoming events.

1 In person events have not always been possible due to health concerns in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In short, the Planning Department’s goal is to hear from communities it has not sufficiently engaged for past Housing Element updates and to elevate the impact of those voices in shaping policy. Groups of interest include communities of color, low-income communities, and immigrant residents, among other vulnerable or hard to reach communities. The project team has incorporated a pilot compensation structure for engagement as an expression of gratitude for the work of the community in strengthening the 2022 Update and to acknowledge the valuable time, knowledge and effort contributed by the participants.

Structure of this Report

This report will first describe the methods that SF Planning employed to reach residents, including the communication tools, the target audiences, and the implementation process. Next, the report presents the input received through these methods, including an explanation of how input was analyzed. The report concludes by articulating the directives received from the community through this process and describing how the 2022 Update is revised to meet these directives. Finally, the report outlines lessons learned and next steps in the continuing outreach and engagement effort.

This report contains reference to two key geographies that were introduced in Draft 1 of the 2022 Update, which are defined here:

Priority Equity Geographies (referred to in Draft 1 as “Priority Geographies”) are areas with a higher density of vulnerable populations as defined by the San Francisco Department of Health, including but not limited to people of color, seniors, youth, people with disabilities, linguistically isolated households, and people living in poverty or unemployed.

Well-Resourced Neighborhoods (referred to in Draft 1 as “High Opportunity Areas”) are defined as “High Resource/Highest Resource” by the California Fair Housing Task Force. These areas have been shown by research to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children.
Figure 3.
Priority Equity Geographies Map

Figure 4.
Well-resourced Neighborhoods Map
3. Methods of Outreach and Engagement

For Phase II of community engagement for the 2022 Update, staff presented the first draft of policies through a variety of groups and approaches. The main approach was working with community-based organizations to design and lead focus groups. In addition, staff participated in community conversations hosted by a variety of organizations and connected with additional stakeholders through meetings, interviews, email, and the project website. The following graphic illustrates the Phase II process.

Figure 5. Phase II Outreach and Engagement Process and Components

Focus groups
Participants representing communities of color, vulnerable groups and different geographies.

Community Leadership
Equity Advisory Council, and Cultural Districts, Human Rights Community Round Table,

Housing Policy Group
Small conversations based on expertise, key reviewers and commenters.
Elevating the Voices of Underrepresented Communities

The following methods were employed to distribute information about the Housing Element 2022 Update planning process and ways to participate in the process:

Focus Groups

Role: The focus groups allowed the project team to elevate those residents most subject to housing inequities in long-form discussions. Their insights provided information to decision-makers about the level of priority to place on the actions that most affect these populations and helped identify gaps in the draft policies.

Who: SF Planning engaged community organizations\(^2\) to recruit focus group participants from the city’s communities of color and other populations vulnerable to housing instability. Participants were generally unaffiliated with housing development and/or housing advocacy groups and were being newly engaged by SF Planning in discussion about their housing needs and experiences. Focus group cohorts represented both citywide groups and neighborhood specific groups. Most groups were designed to be intersectional with a variety of cultural, ethnic, racial, gender, sexuality, age and socio-economic characteristics represented. Certain other cohorts were recruited by a target identity to facilitate deeper conversation on the needs of those specific populations.

Format: Twenty-two (22) virtual and in-person focus groups of approximately 10 people each met for approximately 2 hours. The groups were convened, co-hosted, and/or co-facilitated by community partners. The project team and community co-facilitators presented a project overview and provided informational videos and guided the conversation with a series of questions selected from a menu by the community partner (see Appendix B). This menu of questions was developed by the project team with the intention of guiding discussion towards new ideas in the draft 2022 Update.

\(^2\) See Community Partner Selection Criteria, Appendix C.
### Figure 7. Phase II Focus Groups List & Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Target Community</th>
<th>Community Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>city-wide LGBTQ+ youth</td>
<td>UCSF Alliance Health Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>city-wide People with disabilities &amp; seniors</td>
<td>Senior Disability Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>city-wide Filipino community</td>
<td>International Hotel Manilatown Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>city-wide American Indian community</td>
<td>American Indian Cultural District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>city-wide LGBTQ+</td>
<td>Castro LGBTQ+ Cultural District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>city-wide Transitional youth</td>
<td>SF Rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bayview Transitional youth</td>
<td>BMagic &amp; 3rd St YCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bayview Black community</td>
<td>African American Arts and Cultural District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fillmore/ WA Black community</td>
<td>Booker T Washington Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OMI Black community</td>
<td>I.T. BOOKMAN Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 &amp; 13</td>
<td>Bayview &amp; Richmond Cantonese-speaking</td>
<td>CYC Bayview &amp; Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 &amp; 15</td>
<td>Sunset Cantonese speaking, Moderate to very low-income</td>
<td>Wah Mei School &amp; AWRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tenderloin Cantonese and Mandarin speaking</td>
<td>Tenderloin People’s Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 &amp; 18</td>
<td>Mission Spanish speaking, Latinx seniors, families &amp; youth</td>
<td>Mission Food Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Excelsior Spanish speaking, Latinx families</td>
<td>Family Connections Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Japantown Japanese-American community</td>
<td>Japantown Cultural District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Richmond Moderate to very low-income</td>
<td>Richmond Neighborhood Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Western Moderate to very low-income</td>
<td>ASIAN, Inc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 8. Phase II Focus Group Participant Demographics**

- **Ethnicity / Race**
  - South Asian (e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Nepali, Bangladeshi) 0.5%
  - Middle Eastern or Northern African 0.5%
  - Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander 1.1%
  - Other not listed 2.7%
  - White, European, or Caucasian 20%
  - Southeast Asian (e.g. Filipino, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Thai, Burmese, Indonesian, Laoatian) 5%
  - American Indian 7%
  - Black, African-American, or African descendent 18%
  - East Asian (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Taiwanese) 36%
  - Hispanic, Latino, or Latinx 2%
  - Other 2.2%
  - Prefer not to answer 3.8%

- **Age**
  - 60 or Older 25%
  - 40 - 59 39%
  - 18 - 39 32%

- **Gender**
  - Male 46%
  - Female 52%
  - Other 0.5%
  - Transgender (masculine presenting) 0.5%
  - Transgender (femme presenting) 0.5%
  - Gender non-conforming 2.2%
  - Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming 0.5%
  - Prefer not to answer 3.3%

- **Disability**
  - Yes 14%
  - No 81%
  - Prefer not to answer 4.9%

- **Housing Status**
  - Rent 61%
  - Homeowner 15%
  - Living with family or not paying rent 15%
  - Other not listed 2.7%
  - Unhoused or in an unstable housing situation 2.7%
  - Prefer not to answer 5%
Figure 8. Phase II Focus Group Participant Demographics (cont’d)

Household Type

- Live alone: 26%
- Related adults living together: 11%
- Couple (married or unmarried) no children: 11%
- Family with children: 38%
- Roommates living together: 7%
- Other not listed: 1.6%
- Prefer not to answer: 7%

Household Income

- Less than $50,000: 51%
- $50,001 to $75,000: 19%
- $75,001 to $100,000: 9%
- $100,001 to $125,000: 2.2%
- $125,001 to $150,000: 3.3%
- $150,001 to $200,000: 0.5%
- More than $200,000: 1.6%
- Prefer not to answer: 14%

Screenshots of focus group meeting participants

Top left: SF Rising
Middle left: Castro LGBTQ Cultural District
Bottom left: Senior & Disability Action, People with Disabilities

Top right: Richmond Neighborhood Center
Middle right: Japantown Task Force
Bottom right: Family Connections Center
## Figure 9. Phase II Community Conversations List & Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerable Groups and Communities of Color</th>
<th>Neighborhood Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2 Latino Task Force</td>
<td>14 Planning Association for the Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SF Youth Commission</td>
<td>15 North Beach Neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Larkin Street Youth Services</td>
<td>16 Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Assn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Senior &amp; Disability Action</td>
<td>17 Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Assn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MegaBlack</td>
<td>18 Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Assn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mo’MAGIC</td>
<td>19 Cayuga Neighborhood Improvement Assn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tenderloin People’s Congress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 BMAGIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &amp; 11 HRC Roundtable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 OMI Community Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Bayview-Hunter’s Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Public</th>
<th>Industry Experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods</td>
<td>23 Open Door Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 SF League of Conservation Voters</td>
<td>24 SPUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 SF YIMBY</td>
<td>25 Building Trade Public Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Vulnerable Group + Communities of Color**
- **Neighborhood Associations**
- **General Public**
- **Industry Experts**

* Groups that reach a multi-neighborhood or citywide audience:

- 5
- 6
- 10
- 11
- 21
- 22
- 24
- 25

- Vulnerable Group + Communities of Color
- Neighborhood Associations
- General Public
- Industry Expert

*0 0.5 1 Mile*
Community Group Conversations

**Role:** The community conversations allowed project staff to host conversations with and update community groups and convenings about the 2022 Update. The feedback will inform prioritization of policies and goals, supplementing input gained through the Focus Group discussions.

**Who:** SF Planning engaged any group that requested a presentation by project staff. This included coalitions, collaboratives, CBO boards, committees, homeowner associations, and other groups.

**Format:** The format of the meetings varied and was determined by the community host. Typically, project staff presented an overview of the project and group members provided feedback in whichever format and on whatever topics arose as most urgent. The format was intended to provide more agency and ownership of the policy discussion to the community.

Consulting Experts and Decision-Makers

**Housing Policy Group**

**Role:** The Housing Policy Group (HPG) helped to ground the draft policies in the realities of housing development and service industry leaders to ensure the utility of the draft policies and actions.

**Who:** SF Planning re-engaged representatives of twenty-seven (27) organizations supporting housing development, services, and advocacy originally convened for Phase I of outreach. The HPG includes tenant advocates, housing rights advocates, community development leaders, nonprofit and for-profit real estate developers, real estate industry leaders, social service providers, homeownership advocates, and others. There was an open invitation to the group distributed through a mailing list.

**Format:** SF Planning hosted seven (7) small group forums of 4-8 people on a series of key topics, ranging from how to repair past harms to increasing accountability for the Housing Element.

City Family Briefings and Commission Hearings

**Role:** The briefing participants and commissioners ground draft policies and actions in the functions of housing programs, ensuring the utility of the policies and implementation of the actions. The forums provided opportunities to seek alignment in legislative, housing and equity initiatives and also provided an opportunity for the project team to report on and provide a venue for public input.

**Who:** SF Planning engaged representatives from Human Rights Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Department of Public Health, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions, and others.

**Format:** The format consisted primarily of individual meetings, interagency meetings, and three public hearings.

**Racial Equity Council**

**Role:** The Community Equity Advisory Council (Equity Council) reviewed and provided guidance on the engagement strategy to ensure its fairness and effectiveness in serving the people most impacted by housing inequities, and they reviewed the draft goals, policies and actions. They also engaged and nominated key stakeholders for focus groups and community-led discussions.

**Who:** The council was selected by SF Planning staff, commissioners, and equity experts within the City family to advise SF Planning on issues of racial and social equity.

**Format:** The project team presented at two (2) council meetings (non-public) and held several small group discussions.
Informing All San Franciscans

Website and Digital Participation Platform

Role: A website (https://www.sfhousingelement.org/) was used to publish draft documents and project updates and included a Digital Participation Platform (DPP). The DPP is an interactive participation tool used by SF Planning to gather online input on draft policies.

Who: SF Planning promoted the digital participation tool through GovDelivery (a web-based e-mail subscription management system) bulletins, email announcements, Housing Policy Group meetings, informational meetings, listening sessions, and social media. Given the digital format, the online platform was almost exclusively accessible to people with access to technology.

In total, 194 people shared input through the digital participation platform through 431 comments and 940 ratings; below are their demographics.

The platform collected a total or 940 responses at the policy level from 108 unique sources identified through IP addresses. Most responses (62%) came from people who identify as White, followed by 8% of respondents who identify as East Asian, 8% Latinx/Hispanic, 5% Black/African American, and 5% as other. Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern/North African, South Asian, and Two or More Races each comprised less than 5% each of the total respondents.

44% of respondents were from a household with more than $200,000 in income, followed by a more even distribution of income ranges among the remaining respondents from households earning less than $50,000 a year to $200,000 a year.

Most people who responded (67%) were between the ages of 18 and 39 years old, followed by 24% between the ages of 40 and 59 years old, and 9% at 60 years old or older. No respondents identified as being younger than 18.

A large portion of respondents (70%) identified as male. 27% identified as female, 2% as gender non-binary, and 1% as Other.

More respondents reported that they rent their homes (58%) than those who own (41%). Just 1% of respondents had another unspecified type of living situation.

Format: The website provides project information, draft documents, and a digital participation platform. The platform included the first draft of Goals, Policies, and Actions. A Framework description accompanied each Goal. For each draft policy, users could share how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the policy and its actions and leave an open-ended comment. For each action, users could show support or opposition through a “thumbs up” and “thumbs down” button. The page was available in Spanish, Chinese, and Filipino via Google Translate.

Videos

Staff posted three 7-minute videos in English, Spanish, and Cantonese providing information on housing inequalities, the Housing Element engagement process, and the key policy shifts for consideration. The videos in English were viewed between 200-300 times, with between 20-100 views for videos in Spanish and Cantonese.

Email

Staff provided frequent project updates and invitations to engage with staff through a robust mailing list consisting of nearly 1900 recipients.
Figure 10. Phase II Digital Participation Platform Demographics

**Ethnicity / Race**
- White: 62%
- Other: 5%
- East Asian: 8%
- Latinx / Hispanic: 8%
- Middle Eastern / N.African: 3%
- South Asian: 2%
- Southeast Asian: 4%

**Housing Status**
- Own: 41%
- Rent: 58%

**Age**
- 18 - 39: 67%
- 40 - 59: 24%
- 60 or Older: 9%

**Gender**
- Female: 27%
- Male: 70%
- Gender non-binary: 2%
- Other: 1%

**Household Type**
- Live alone: 26%
- Roommates living together: 14%
- Related adults living together: 1%
- Prefer not to answer: 1%
- Couple (married or unmarried) no children: 36%

**Household Income**
- Less than $50,000: 8%
- $50,001 to $75,000: 5%
- $75,001 to $100,000: 11%
- $100,001 to $125,000: 8%
- $125,001 to $150,000: 8%
- More than $150,000: 15%
- $200,000 or more: 44%
Combined Reach of Phase I and Phase II Outreach and Engagement

Where Phase I of outreach and engagement centered around neighborhood groups, working groups, local government agencies, and civic leaders, Phase II aimed to be intentional about reaching vulnerable populations and in very specific geographies of San Francisco. The map (right) and table (below) summarize both phases of outreach.

**Figure II. Phase I and II Outreach and Engagement List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II Community Conversations</th>
<th>Phase II Focus Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission*</td>
<td>Latino Task Force</td>
<td>UCSF Alliance Health Project*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 2020</td>
<td>Latino Task Force</td>
<td>Senior &amp; Disability Action*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMA Planning 101</td>
<td>SF Youth Commission</td>
<td>Senior &amp; Disability Action*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHCD Working Group*</td>
<td>Larkin Street Youth Services</td>
<td>International Hotel Manilatown Center*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
<td>Senior &amp; Disability Action*</td>
<td>American Indian Cultural District*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 10 CBO</td>
<td>MegaBlack*</td>
<td>Castro LGBTQ+ Cultural District*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis CAC</td>
<td>Mo’MAGIC</td>
<td>SF Rising*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 1 Townhall</td>
<td>Tenderloin People’s Congress</td>
<td>BMagic &amp; 3rd St YCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Community Coalition</td>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
<td>African American Arts and Cultural District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPUR Digital Discourse</td>
<td>HRC Roundtable*</td>
<td>Booker T Washington Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Element Overview*</td>
<td>HRC Roundtable*</td>
<td>I.T. Bookman Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4 Virtual</td>
<td>OMI Community Collaborative</td>
<td>CYC Bayview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Bayview-Hunter’s Point</td>
<td>CYC Richmond (Cantonese-speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Forward</td>
<td>Planning Association for the Richmond</td>
<td>Wah Mei School &amp; AWRC (Cantonese-speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Forward</td>
<td>North Beach Neighbors</td>
<td>Wah Mei School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Forward</td>
<td>Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Tenderloin People’s Congress (Cantonese-speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF YIMBY*</td>
<td>Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Mission Food Hub (Spanish-speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHCD*</td>
<td>Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Mission Food Hub (Spanish-speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderloin Housing Clinic La Voz Latina</td>
<td>Cayuga Neighborhood Improvement Association</td>
<td>Family Connections Centers (Spanish-speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
<td>Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Japantown Cultural District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Listening Session*</td>
<td>SF League of Conservation Voters*</td>
<td>Richmond Neighborhood Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7*</td>
<td>SF YIMBY*</td>
<td>ASIAN, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>Open Door Legal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Listening Session*</td>
<td>SPUR*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Senior Center*</td>
<td>Building Trade Public Policy Committee*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Listening Session*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Listening Session*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore/Western Addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEARD*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEARD*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*groups that reach a multi-neighborhood or citywide audience
Figure 12. Phase I and II Outreach and Engagement Map

Groups that reach a multi-neighborhood or citywide audience
4. Public Input Summary by Outreach Method

**Focus Group**

**Approach to Analysis**

Conversation highlights were produced from the recordings and notes for each focus group. These highlights were reviewed and verified with the community partner who facilitated or hosted the event. These summaries were processed using qualitative data analysis software to identify the most frequently mentioned subjects, from which ten (10) themes and eighteen (18) sub-themes were identified. The input was then organized and summarized by these sub-themes. This section reports on the common themes running through the twenty-two (22) focus group conversations.

**Input Overview**

Across the twenty-two (22) focus group conversations, many shared experiences, criticisms of existing housing programs and policies, and proposed solutions resonated with a majority of the participants. This section synthesizes that input into seven primary cross-cutting ideas, which are discussed below. For greater insight into each topic, please refer to the cited focus group Theme Summaries in the appendices.

**PRIORITIZATION OF HOUSING RESOURCES**

Participants shared their experiences with housing-related government programs and policies, and there is a generalized perception that existing programs discriminate against certain communities, that opportunities are unattainable because of the low chances of success and the number of barriers in the application process, and that affordable housing is not being granted to those who need it most. To combat this perceived discrimination and dysfunction and create a more just system, participants offered input on how the City should be prioritizing the distribution of resources. In sum, participants want to see transparency in prioritization criteria and overall selection processes for housing programs.

Many participants want to see an expansion and/or restructuring of the preference system assigning priority in the affordable housing lottery to recognize a wider variety of factors such as race, ethnicity, occupation, and experience of past housing discrimination. We heard from every Focus group that the City needs to prioritize new housing for those who are most vulnerable to housing insecurity - low-income communities, communities of color and other vulnerable groups including children, seniors, and people with disabilities – and those that have been harmed by past discriminatory government actions. Priority communities mentioned include: unhoused families and individuals, Black Americans, American Indians, families (including single parents), individuals previously displaced by discriminatory policies (i.e., Certificate of Preference holders and their descendants), seniors (including moderate-income seniors looking to downsize), teachers, transitional age youth, recent college graduates, families, extremely low, very low- and moderate-income individuals, formerly incarcerated individuals, caregivers and people with disabilities.

Many participants voiced that a preference for housing opportunities should be given to those born and raised in the neighborhood or in San Francisco, existing residents, and those who have been in affordable housing wait lists for longer. Others stated

---

3 Conversation Highlights are available upon request.
4 See Appendix A.
5 See Focus Group Summary 17.
that artists, community-based organization and small business workforce should also be prioritized for housing. While some participants strongly support prioritization by race (Black community, American Indian community), other participants perceive prioritization by needs and income as the fairest approach.6

Participants highlighted that special consideration in the affordable housing lottery is needed for groups that are likely to present overlapping vulnerabilities including sex workers, foster children and transitional age youth, seniors and people with disabilities, single parents with children in emergency situations (victims of domestic violence, crime, harassment by landlords, mental health crisis, drug users) and families and individuals with unresolved immigration status.

Lastly, participants agreed that SF Planning and the City should honor past commitments to communities that have been harmed by discriminatory policies. Participants belonging to the American Indian community made reference to the Relocation Program, which promised to provide housing, while Japanese American participants agreed that the right to return should honor Certificates of Preference granted to Japanese American Families.

“Black people built many of San Francisco’s thriving neighborhoods, with businesses, food, and services that met many of the Black community’s needs and wants. Redevelopment and urban renewal took a lot of this away. The people who helped these neighborhoods grow (and their kids) should be prioritized above folks who are newer or just arriving in the housing lottery.”

[OMI Focus Group]

ACCESS TO HOUSING RESOURCES

Participants described how a lack of transparency and accountability in housing-related programs and processes creates an environment of generalized distrust of public agencies.7 Many participants felt that existing systems stigmatize and re-victimize the families and individuals they are trying to help. Vulnerable or at-risk participants spoke of seeking alternative solutions to their urgent housing needs, rather than seeking support from government housing programs that have failed, disappointed, or victimized them in the past. Participants recounted accepting housing without contracts and/or in overcrowded conditions, taking on debt, moving away from sources of employment, and having no alternative but to step into unhealthy/abusive interpersonal relationships that increase their risk of revictimization.8 This environment, combined with a lack of progress in uplifting vulnerable communities, is contributing to a pervasive sense that “other” community groups are receiving all the benefits. Solutions suggested by participants generally spoke to a need to humanize the system with increased and improved guidance and better dissemination of information.

There was wide-spread support for place-based resource hubs where community members can access information, social services, and resources (including housing-related resources and support) delivered in their language and by members from their community. This community hub approach was specifically advocated for by American Indian and Black participants. Increasing representation from people of color and vulnerable communities in the staffing of housing-related programs was mentioned as an opportunity to generate greater empathy and more equitable outcomes.9 Young participants were particularly interested in a model that is youth-focused and can provide resources and training in essential topics not taught at school such as wealth creation, taxes, and housing. Overall, participants were very supportive of partnerships that involve trusted community-based organizations to disseminate information, reach the most vulnerable community groups, and connect families and individuals in need with housing organizations and resources. Organizations cited as potential partners included service providers (clinics, medical and psychiatric care), schools, senior centers, and local non-profits.

Mental health providers working with LGBTQ+ youth stressed the need to increase the number of case managers and navigation services both at housing sites and through mobile services. They

6 See Focus Group Summary 10.
7 See Focus Group Summary 14.
8 See Focus Group Summary 15.
9 See Focus Group Summary 15.
encouraged an approach that integrates supportive and mental health services for the most vulnerable. For example, staff at the navigation centers and other access points for the city’s Homelessness Response System should provide on-sites assistance with the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing’s Online Navigation and Entry System (ONE System). Participants expressed the importance of assigning case managers that can consistently provide guidance to unhoused or at-risk families and individuals and support them with application requirements in a manner that is trauma-informed in order to build trust and restore dignity.

For focus group participants, it is essential that the city increases efforts to make information more easily available and accessible. Applying to affordable housing is a burdensome and overwhelming process, and families and individuals need to reapply every time a new opportunity is available. Participants would like to see a “universal application process” that gets updated if applicants’ needs or goals change and provides a “unique housing waitlist number”. Other participants suggested limiting the number of applications per property to give applicants a greater chance of success. Once housed, families and individuals can enter a separate “housing ladder” process that will allow them to access opportunities over time as their needs change but will not compete with first-time applicants. Materials should be readily available in different languages, through varied media, and in a timely manner to enable communities to influence decisions.

Furthermore, participants want to see alternatives to existing forms of means testing that prevent at-risk families and individuals from accessing existing resources. The extent and type of documentation required to rent and apply for affordable housing is a major barrier for many communities including families, youth, immigrant communities, seniors, formerly incarcerated individuals, and communities with seasonal, variable income, or informal employment. Furthermore, the Area Median Income brackets used to target affordable housing were seen as unfair because they do not adequately serve extremely and very low income households. This leaves the impression in the Black community in OMI and Bayview Hunters Point and others that affordable housing in not for them.

“A lot of our [American Indian] families are here in San Francisco through the Relocation Program. Part of that deal was that government would help with housing—that was part of the plan, supposedly—and I don’t think many families got help with housing. I know my family didn’t.”

[American Indian Focus Group]

RIGHT TO HOUSING

Many of the participants shared their personal experiences of harms caused by discriminatory housing policy and systems. More work is needed in partnership with communities to identify the harms and dismantle housing-related systems and policies perpetuating such harms. It is important to note that for many communities these harms are present experiences. Discussions with participants suggest that San Francisco could start by repairing the harms caused by discriminatory policy that led to the displacement of American Indian, Black, Filipino, and Japanese American communities. Other communities undergoing recent displacement resulting from economic inequality (global and local) such as immigrant and Latino/e/x communities, seniors, families, and youth, should also be considered. Participants are aware of the need to dismantle biases by increasing cultural competency across communities, and to create spaces for alliances between different communities “where people can be human together.”

Participants expressed the need for a housing system that is just, driven by equity, humanizing, and where everyone is treated with dignity. Each applicant should be considered and provided options that match their needs and goals. Everyone should have access to housing that dignifies them as human beings, and where they can feel safe. To thrive, vulnerable communities require access to housing as well as other supports to navigate government systems, generate a steady income, and access services such as healthcare or childcare. Participants also noted that the right to housing

10 See Focus Group Summary 05.
11 See Focus Group Summaries 02 and 03.
12 See Focus Group Summary 02.
13 See Focus Group Summary 17.
14 See Focus Group Summary 18.
should include the right to choose, including the right to choose where to live and the right to decline housing. Members of the senior group also noted that this freedom of choice is especially critical for those displaced people who come back. And members from American Indian, Black, and Latino/e/x expressed a desire to stay in or close to their existing neighborhoods.

Through reflection on the meaning of a “right to housing,” participants articulated what the quality of housing for all people should be and what can be restored or repaired by facilitating the return of people displaced from the city by discriminatory actions. In these discussions there was a general recognition that the “right to housing” is signified by the way we house the most vulnerable. Participants expressed that a right to housing means that everyone, regardless of income, race, background, or special circumstances, should have equal access to affordable housing. The idea that people do not need to be “fixed” before being provided housing resonated with participants.15

For many participants, a right to housing encompasses the “right to return” for former residents and their descendant who have been displaced by from the city due to discriminatory actions and economic inequality. A right to return was described as providing safe spaces, cultural amenities, and adequate supporting services for returning people and their communities to thrive. This was critical for American Indian participants and others who no longer have the social services that their community used to contain. For most of the groups, right to return means acknowledging the history and discriminatory policies that led to displacement in the first place, recognizing that such policies and practices continue to displace and harm communities today, and actively work to dismantle such policies and practices.16

When speaking of the quality of housing that residents should be guaranteed, participants stated that housing should be a place that provides privacy, freedom to come in and out, safety, access to affordable services (groceries and public transportation), good quality spaces, and a healthy environment where people can thrive. Housing should offer families and individuals opportunities to be in community and access services that can support them in building better lives. Such services include career and job training, rehabilitation and mental health services, and access to trauma-informed counsellors and social/case workers.17 And, housing should be near, or be accessible to, work opportunities as the right to housing is interrelated with the ability to afford housing through the right to work.

“There are families that we have to make do with living in a single room, living with two or three children. To pay for the apartment we need three or four families and the living conditions aren’t good... there is the violence that exists between all the families sharing the apartment.”

[Spanish-speaking Excelsior Focus Group]

PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Overall, participants agreed on the need to make more affordable housing available to everyone, including building new affordable, government subsidized housing, and reforming affordable housing programs.18 They want to see the review and approval process of affordable housing projects prioritized so that housing serving extremely low-income and very low-income households can be produced more quickly. Some supported streamlining of review processes to achieve this. At the same time, participants want the Planning Department to review plans from developers to determine if new development will displace communities and to create policies that prioritize tenants and low-income people, not developers.19 Finally, they wanted to see public funds for housing prioritized for home ownership programs.

While participants acknowledged that market rate housing also needs to be built for higher income groups, conversations were focused on affordable housing and prioritization of housing production for the most vulnerable groups. Participants acknowledged that such policy should be implemented carefully to avoid unintended displacement and discrimination. Participants considered that there is

15 See Focus Group Summary 02
16 See Focus Group Summary 04.
17 See Focus Group Summary 01.
18 Focus Group Summary 17.
19 Focus Group Summary 03.
a need for real and urgent action in housing-related matters. There is a sense that new development “brings money to the city’s pockets,” but delivers no benefits to their communities.\textsuperscript{20}

Participants wanted to ensure that neighborhoods and communities are protected from displacement by increasing safety; supporting cultural anchors and cultural communities; and, utilizing cultural hubs as “resource hubs” that include social services that are responsive to the particular needs of the community and provided by members of the community. For many participants affordability, job access, income and training and opportunities are closely related to housing (being able to access, afford and stay in housing) and should be addressed in parallel to prevent further displacement.

Participants also expressed that San Francisco’s rent control program needs to be updated to ensure profits/benefits from this program are equitably distributed. Participants mentioned the following ideas that the City should explore the following: attaching rent control to a household’s income, not to property; regulating large property owners to prevent displacement; capping the number of market-rate units that are allowed to be built and taking steps to remove profit-incentive from housing; and capping rent at 30% of a household's income.\textsuperscript{21}

Participants expressed that community infrastructure and services need to be strengthened and access expanded along with new housing production. They felt that new housing should include onsite community infrastructure or be located in proximity to hubs where services can be accessed walking, cycling, or using public transit. Community infrastructure and services mentioned by participants include:

- Social services, health services, nursing, clinics, elder care services
- Postal service
- Multi-lingual services
- Cultural activities
- Shared community amenities (laundry, internet, computers, TV)
- Grocery stores, restaurants (affordable and culturally relevant choices are needed)\textsuperscript{22}

Building more permanent affordable housing, in general, as well as on city-owned land, resonated with participants from across the city.\textsuperscript{23} Participants from focus groups for western neighborhood residents expressed that to prepare their communities to receive housing, the City will need to strengthen and expand access to community services and develop distinct strategies that focus on the unique qualities of these neighborhoods to generate economic development opportunities. These opportunities could include improved or new tourist attractions (for example Ocean Beach, Golden Gate Park, Sutro Baths swimming pools), business opportunities and job creation. West side participants mentioned that this strategy would require a less centralized approach to public transit by creating job opportunities and shopping opportunities in the western neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{24} However, some participants from eastern and southern neighborhoods felt that they will not be welcomed in new housing proposed to be built in opportunity areas on the northern and western sides of the city as there is a perception that the houses will be for the people who work in technology and tourists and that “affordable housing” will remain unaffordable to them.

**WEALTH BUILDING OPPORTUNITIES**

A majority of participants agreed that San Francisco’s high cost of living underlies the housing crisis, with inequitable outcomes for working families, very low- and moderate-income communities, seniors, youth, communities of color, and other vulnerable families and individuals. Sources of income that are accessible to these communities have not kept up with a raising cost of living, resulting in negative impacts to quality of life. Participants shared that to make ends meet, they are forced to hold multiple jobs and accept longer commutes, which in turn negatively impacts their health and the educational outcomes of their children. Vulnerable families and individuals are exposed to unsanitary and overcrowding housing conditions, that breed domestic violence, abuse, and mental health problems.\textsuperscript{25} Participants expressed that housing policy decisions need to be made in the context of overall affordability and cost of living, which includes other basic household expenses such as childcare, groceries, and utilities.

\textsuperscript{20} See Focus Group Summary 14.
\textsuperscript{21} Focus Group Summary 03.
\textsuperscript{22} Focus Group Summary 06.
\textsuperscript{23} Focus Group Summary 02.
\textsuperscript{24} Focus Group Summary 06.
\textsuperscript{25} See Focus Group Summary 12.
Participants agreed with the need to increase financial supports that can help communities of color and low-income communities build intergenerational wealth through home ownership. This was particularly echoed in the focus groups with majority Black participants. They want programs to prioritize Black, American Indian, and low-income communities and to include targeted down-payment assistance loans and grants. Many participants specified that communities of color should have access to financial support programs that give them priority to own in their communities.26

Participants considered that the City should improve methods to disseminate information and provide educational opportunities for communities to learn about existing City resources and programs related to housing. Vulnerable communities, in unstable housing situations or financially stressed, are not exposed to the resources they need in a timely and culturally appropriate manner (includes in-language resources).27 Participants suggested that the City and Planning could collaborate with a network of trusted community partners and institutions to provide access to information and educational opportunities related to housing. Participants also suggested that this information could be provided in schools to reach younger generations and families. The following educational topics were mentioned:

- The history of discriminatory policies within the context of housing (i.e., redlining).
- Rights in general, and specifically tenants’ rights and contracts.
- Wealth creation: real estate, rental, homeownership, equity, and income.
- Financial literacy needed to enter the workforce (401K, I-9 forms), pay off loans, or apply for housing (credit scores).
- Affordable housing resources, and guidance with applications.

Participants agreed that while a lack of affordable housing continues to push families and individuals out of existing job markets, more and better paid job opportunities are needed for families and individuals to afford housing and maintain housing.28 Younger participants stressed the importance to create stable, well-paid jobs, accessible to young people to prevent the displacement of at-risk youth.29 This topic was particularly important to young participants, and Spanish-speaking youth, families and seniors (many of whom are still employed due to a lack of access to retirement opportunities). Groups including immigrants, transitional-aged youth, and seniors, need more support finding income generating opportunities. For these communities, generating a steady income to cover the cost of living in San Francisco is particularly challenging due to experience requirements, language barriers, unresolved immigration status, and the seasonal/ informal aspect of many of the jobs they can access. Young participants would like to have more support finding and preparing for a job. Accessing job opportunities with limited public transit options remains a challenge to many communities. Participants from Southeast San Francisco as well as the Sunset, described how their neighborhoods remain disconnected from job opportunities, with few reliable public transit options available to them.

**TYPES OF HOUSING**

Participants, who were predominantly people of color and other marginalized groups, would like to see affordable housing built in their communities. This means housing that is affordable to them as well as extremely low and very low-income households. Interior spaces should be generous and offer the basic accommodations so residents can live with dignity. Basic accommodations mentioned include a private bathroom, a kitchen, elevators, a bathtub, and ample circulation space for wheelchairs and walking aids. The facilities should be clean and safe. New housing should be welcoming and include amenities that will help community members thrive such as green open spaces or community gardens, community rooms and connections to cultural programming. Participants would like to see new housing in their communities that is and looks permanent (not transitional).30 In Bayview Hunters Point, participants specifically wanted family-friendly detached home
and townhouse development with private yards. Youth from the neighborhood felt that much new housing is too dense and large and "stacks upon each other like jails."

- Participants mentioned variety in housing types is needed:
  - Housing designed for seniors, people with disabilities, formerly incarcerated individuals and other vulnerable groups (drug users, unhoused) offering on-site health and social services support and meals.
  - Multigenerational housing and housing for families with kid friendly spaces. Participants shared experiences of landlords discriminating against families with children, and the stress of having neighbors complain.
  - Duplexes, fourplexes, townhouses, infill housing, multi-bedroom, and housing above existing commercial corridors.
  - Free housing for unhoused residents that offers services and meals.
  - Renovated houses and Single Room Occupancy residences (SROs) to improve quality of life of low-income residents.
  - Housing for moderate and middle-income seniors that are looking to downsize, which could in turn free up houses for families.

Participants would not like to see small units of the quality of existing SRO’s, however, there was interest in tiny homes and compact housing, which would afford outdoor space, light, and air. Participants agree that more housing in San Francisco means more density, but what is considered an acceptable new housing building height varied from 3-6 stories for western neighborhoods to 10-12 stories in more central neighborhoods. Some participants mentioned mixed-income housing as a housing type to be included, but many more highlighted that mixed income housing creates tensions between residents due to cultural and class differences.

While participants would like to live in mixed income communities, in their experience mixed income housing is not perceived as contributing to a high quality of life of residents. Some participants, including those from the Chinese, Japanese, and LGBTQ+ groups, spoke of the need for housing to include spaces for cultural activities to support the community cohesion and longevity.

**ACCOUNTABILITY AND EMPOWERMENT**

In general, participants did not address empowerment, but rather the sense of powerlessness that they have experienced when attempting to access city programs and resources (such as the affordable housing lottery). Participants shared housing-related experiences that have left them feeling unheard, overwhelmed, exhausted, and powerless to improve housing challenges that seem insurmountable. “No matter how much you work you cannot change your outcomes.” Participants expressed that existing housing programs and systems contribute to this sense of powerlessness by de-humanizing already vulnerable community members, and by operating without transparency, and accountability. These systems are re-victimizing vulnerable groups, perpetuating inequities and harms from discrimination, and alienating communities. Some participants also felt that Planning is incentivized to prioritize the interests of developers, rather than the needs of tenants and low-income people. The Planning Department’s funding structure and relationship to developers adds to a perception corruption and conflict of interest. Similarly, some participants made reference to developers’ “divide and conquer tactics” within communities and believe SF Planning has a role in preventing these situations.

Participants wanted to see existing housing programs reformed to provide accountability and transparency. They directed that programs should offer results, work with deadlines, audits, and adequate oversight. Negligence in case management should be addressed. Participants expressed frustration and distrust of the housing lottery system: it is “difficult to understand how decisions are made,” and assigning housing should not be “a matter of luck.” Participants think that better communication of the stories of

31 See Focus Group Summary 15.
32 See Focus Group Summary 05.
33 See Focus Group Summary 14.
families and individuals successfully housed will build trust with the community.

Participants stated that effective community engagement must be supported by capacity building (training and education on housing-related issues), to enable community members to be fully informed and guide processes. Capacity building should take place on a regular basis, not only when outreach is required for a plan update. Participants mentioned the following areas where capacity building is needed: tenant and housing rights and responsibilities, real estate and homeownership, financial literacy and wealth creation, equity and cultural competency, income creation and job opportunities, policy and legislation, public speaking, leadership, existing housing programs, and other city resources.

Participants from the Sunset Chinese community and the LGBTQ+ community mentioned the importance of city agency leaders and Supervisors attending community engagement events. Many participants emphasized the role of community engagement events in re-introducing the experience of a “sense of community that breeds joy and happiness, which our communities have been stripped of.” Participants acknowledge that the process of developing diverse leadership and representation within city agencies will take time and investment, but when decision makers attend community meetings, they build their own capacity to advocate for, commit to, and make better (more equitable) decisions on behalf of the communities they serve. 34

Finally, participants expressed the need to continue to raise awareness on how systemic racism, discriminatory policies, and economic inequality contribute to the housing crisis. Many Black participants expressed the importance in diverse representation in City staff to ensure that this awareness and action is guided by people of color. Everyone plays a role in either perpetuating or solving this issue: “People with money don’t see themselves as part of the problem - there is a lack of understanding and desire to really change something very deep and fundamental in humanity, in equity, and [in contradiction with the image that America projects].”

Housing Policy Group

Approach to Analysis

The Planning Department reconvened the Housing Policy Group (HPG) from Phase II of outreach to discuss key topics related to the draft housing element. In five sessions, different topic and draft policies were reviewed and discussed. In addition to general feedback and thoughts, we asked each group to:

1. Identify actions that are essential to keep in the draft as it is revised,
2. to discuss issues or ideas that seem to be missing or could be added to the draft to better achieve the overall goal, and
3. to identify 1-3 actions that should be seen as top priorities.

General feedback on each topic is organized below as “what to keep”, “what’s missing”, and “top priorities.” More specific suggestions for changes or additions to the draft housing element can be found in the Housing Policy Group Summary (see Appendix D).
Input Overview

REPAIRING PAST HARMs
Participants discussed the actions in the Draft Housing Element which are intended to directly respond to past racial discrimination in the housing element and begin the process of repairing the harms from these actions.

What to Keep: Several participants voiced support for the draft’s overall effort to “acknowledge, repair and empower” communities that experienced past harms. One participant said, “for a city to say this explicitly creates a great platform to grow on.” Participants particularly mentioned liking the goals focused on bringing back displaced populations and providing additional resources for community-based organizations. People generally liked the framing about repair and reparations but there was some concern about whether the City could live up to the language here. One person said, “I would anticipate a reaction that this is just more rhetoric.” In general, the suggestion was to keep the language in the draft but add more specificity about accountability and to identify the funding necessary to implement more of the actions. One participant said, “not having resources means shifting the burden to the community.”

There was a discussion about the terms such as “American Indian, Black and other people of color” which the draft uses to refer to groups that are targeted for support. One suggestion was to use a standard term throughout but to include a section of the document that more clearly defines who is included.

What’s Missing: Several people expressed concern that the intention to bring displaced people back to the city was still too vague to be effective. More than one participant called for preferences by race for affordable housing units. Others called for offering opportunities first to people who have been displaced and want to return. One asked for new resources to train community members to fill out housing applications to register for lotteries. Several suggested additional ways that the city could invest in engaging communities. Some participants asked for more consistency from the city on racial equity noting that they have to deal with multiple city departments which each have different approaches. Another added that “it seems inconsistent for planning to hold this position pushing for repairing harms while other departments seem to be working for the opposite.”

There was widespread concern about how communities would hold the City to implementing these actions. There was also concern about how communities could track all of the different actions. One suggestion was to pick 4 top priorities each year and share results with the community rather than bringing everything and overwhelming people.

Top Priorities: Most participants mentioned concerns about accountability as their top priority in this area. Some asked that the Department “sharpen the language about accountability” while others suggested more attention to implementation strategies or metrics of success. One participant suggested that the City provide customized newsletters for each district outlining key outcomes from the Housing Element relevant to the priorities of that community. Another suggested that the City host monthly round tables in each community to report on priority actions.

BUILDING HOUSING IN WELL-RESOURCED NEIGHBORHOODS
Participants discussed a set of proposed actions in the draft element which aim to expand the supply of housing and of affordable housing in “high opportunity” parts of the city.

What to Keep: There was enthusiasm about the goal of building 50% of new housing in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods. Most participants were also enthusiastic about the goal of prioritizing 50% of affordable housing funding for these areas but there were some concerns about the practicality of that goal. Existing actions related to tenant protections and land banking were also popular.

What’s Missing: Nearly all participants agreed that the draft needed to say more about strategies for community education and outreach in order to be successful in achieving the ambitious goals for Well-Resourced Neighborhoods. The strategy of funding CBOs to lead community education was suggested by several participants with some stressing that there needed to be funding for CBS to “staff up.” Several participants noted the need for
more actions related to tenant protections. Affordable homeownership development was also suggested as a strategy for promoting community acceptance in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods. Some participants argued that the City should require family sized units in new buildings, particularly in areas where density limits might cause developers to build only very small units. Others felt that requiring larger market rate units would make housing less affordable without necessarily serving families in need. There was some disagreement about the desirability of identifying community benefits in exchange for streamlining. Some felt that this was a good way to build support for more density, while others were concerned about that the cost of benefits could make the needed housing unfeasible.

**Top Priorities:** Multiple participants identified capacity building for community-based organizations and construction of permanently affordable units as critical priorities. In addition, up-zoning ambitiously, community education and engagement and expanded case management were identified as priorities by some participants.

**BUILDING HOUSING IN PRIORITY EQUITY GEOGRAPHIES**

Participants discussed the Draft Housing Element Actions that aim to support and strengthen neighborhoods identified as being most at risk for further displacement.

**What to Keep:** Many participants appreciated the draft’s goal of ensuring geographic equity in where new housing is built. In particular, participants mentioned wanting to preserve the actions related to promoting community ownership of land, expanded neighborhood preferences, implementing a Right to Return policy, expanding homeownership production and prioritizing homelessness prevention investments in Priority Equity Geographies.

**What’s Missing:** There was a discussion about homeownership programs and how to target resources to expand homeownership. Participants discussed how homeownership projects could be built on lots that might be too small for typical rental buildings. Participants also expressed interest in easier to use programs to help homeowners fund and manage repairs – possibly staffed by local nonprofit organizations because “nobody’s grandmother wants to hire a contractor and supervise them.” Another participant suggested a need for streamlined building permit process for residents of Priority Equity Geographies to make it easier for homeowners in these neighborhoods to make repairs.

There was also a discussion of preferences and the Certificates of Preference issued by the former Redevelopment Agency to residents that were displaced. Participants expressed concern about the difficulty residents have had using the Certificates and suggested that the housing resources available in the City do not well match the needs of the Certificate holders.

Participants also suggested that the draft needs to say more about Environmental Justice and what it means for communities and to spell out more clearly how we will recapture the land value created by zoning changes and ensure that that value goes to the community.

**Top Priorities:** Priority actions mentioned included, expanding homeownership production by building on smaller lots, targeting homelessness resources to Priority Equity Geographies, ensuring that new buildings are spread across the city more equitably, and promoting community ownership of land and land acquisition strategies.

**SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZED BUILDINGS**

Participants discussed strategies for expanding the supply of small and medium sized buildings throughout the city.

**What to Keep:** Most participants supported the idea integrating streamlining and community benefits into packaged deals. One participant summarized the discussion by saying “The challenge of getting things approved becomes leverage. We are talking about getting rid of all of that leverage. But then you have to make sure that every streamlining is accompanied by community benefits including strong labor agreements.” And another agreed “When there are things we all agree are benefits, exchanging them for streamlining makes sense.”

**What’s Missing:** Someone suggested that streamlining should be accompanied by a fixed approval
Another participant suggested that the document was missing actions that would make it easier to demolish existing buildings which could be key. But because demolitions will raise community concerns, someone else suggested adopting objective standards for what kind of demolition is acceptable and another participant suggested that demolition could be limited to owner occupied homes in order to protect renters.

Participants also discussed the potential geographic distribution of future small multi-family buildings. Some participants were concerned with impacts on tenants and one suggested only offering streamlining for these buildings in neighborhoods where 2/3 of the homes are owner occupied. There was disagreement about the potential for modular construction to facilitate the construction of small multi-family buildings. San Francisco unions have opposed modular unless it is built to city (not state) standards. However, there is no labor opposition to adoption of Cross Laminated Timber technology which also promises to lower construction costs. Someone suggested that it would be ideal if the city had standard duplex and 4-plex building designs which could be approved without any discretionary approval process. Several others expressed support for this idea because it might reduce the risk for small property owners.

**Top Priorities:** Top priorities for participants included ensuring that developers of small buildings were local/people of color, ensuring that these buildings are financially feasible, and focusing on larger, higher density projects along transit corridors.

**MIDDLE INCOME HOUSING**

Participants discussed potential actions to expand the supply of housing affordable to middle- and moderate-income households.

**What to Keep:** In general, people liked that the draft included a mix of subsidized and unsubsidized strategies for serving middle income households. People mostly supported the notion that it was appropriate for the City to provide subsidy for permanently income restricted middle income units and also to adopt policies that support market provision of unrestricted units serving this income group. Participants called for preserving the draft’s emphasis on using public land for affordable housing, streamlining development of middle-income housing, facilitating small multi-family buildings in lower density areas, encouraging employers to build industry specific housing, and encouraging employers to contribute to homeownership programs. Several participants expressed support for streamlining approval of Accessory Dwelling Units and expanding that to other building types as well.

**What’s Missing:** One participant pointed out that eliminating parking requirements could help make more middle-income housing financially possible. Others asked that the actions more strongly encourage shared equity homeownership (CLTs, deed restrictions) that allow wealth building but preserve affordability for future buyers.

Participants suggested that the draft could be clearer about which incentives would come with affordability restrictions. Some of the actions mention restrictions and others don’t and it was not clear to everyone whether that was intentional. In particular, there was a disagreement about whether deed restrictions should be required in exchange for permit streamlining for small multi-family buildings. Some people argued that ‘the housing is the benefit’ while others argued that including affordable units was necessary to ensure that the public benefits from changes like this. Others called for close financial feasibility analysis to ensure that any requirements don’t make these projects infeasible. Someone pointed out that the goal with allowing more small multi-family buildings would be to create more abundant housing citywide which could lower prices but not necessarily ensure that each individual project would be affordable, and another participant suggested that we could test that idea for a period of time and if buildings were generally providing middle income units we scale it up and if not, we could shut it down. One suggestion for encouraging more small multi-family would be to eliminate the need for a Conditional Use permit when a homeowner demolishes their single-family home to build a new building. Some participants felt that calling out educator housing was not appropriate because there are so many other people who need and deserve help.

**Top Priorities:** Top priorities mentioned by participants included facilitating development of small...
multi-family buildings, streamlining ADUs, using public land for mixed-income affordable housing development and allowing group homes as a principally permitted use.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Participants discussed potential strategies for holding City government accountable to community priorities and ensuring implementation of the Housing Element’s ambitious racial and social equity goals after the plan is adopted.

What Does Accountability Mean? Participants were asked how they would define accountability and who they thought the Housing Element should be maintaining accountability to. Some participants articulated a fairly narrow view of accountability which involved simply identifying who was responsible for implementing each action so that stakeholders would know where to turn if actions were not being implemented. Others focused on transparency calling for development of metrics that would indicate whether the actions were having the intended effect. But a number of participants equated accountability with power sharing.

These participants pointed out that creating accountability to communities that have been harmed by past planning processes requires changing power dynamics and many expressed real concern about whether the City was ready to do that. One participant said “100% it’s power, and the housing element will be a bust if those who have it now don’t share it.” Another added “We have felt that this [Housing Element] process is a breath of fresh air, but we don’t trust that your bosses will let you implement it.” Several participants expressed a sense that accountability would require “delegating” decision making or budgeting power to “communities themselves” while others seemed to feel like it would be possible for the department to craft more of a partnership with communities. One said “It has to be shared, not completely given over in all areas. It is about saying we are not holding all the cards but we have equal parts of the deck.”

What to Keep: In general participants liked that the draft Housing Element recognized the need to partner with communities and to engage people in ongoing implementation, but many felt that the specific actions identified were not concrete or specific enough. There was some discussion of what kind of accountability would be most helpful. One participant observed “in America the only real way to make people do what they don’t want to do is to sue them.” Several others responded that there were better ways to hold the City accountable. One suggested “The Housing Element is a policy document. If we take it at an aspirational level - there are more values-based statements here than in past housing elements. We can use politics as a tool.”

What’s Missing: There was general agreement that it would be helpful for City staff to ‘convene with the community’ at intervals to help people understand what progress was being made on Housing Element goals. Several participants praised the outreach and engagement that has accompanied the Housing Element update and suggested that a similar level of effort may be necessary in the future on an ongoing basis. But other participants were concerned about increasing the number of meetings that community members were expected to attend. One participant said “For American Indians - if we had a town hall - people love to eat, we need space to talk but people would want to know what the goal is. It could be harmful to engage people too much without showing action.” Another participant added “We lose engagement once people feel like they are not heard.”

Someone suggested that the department publish individualized fact sheets about what progress was made in specific communities. While there was broad support for the idea of individualized reporting to targeted communities, there were different perspectives about what the right forum would be for the City to engage communities. Someone suggested that the department could use Cultural Districts to identify priorities and regularly report on progress. Others were concerned that Cultural Districts didn’t reach all the relevant communities. Someone else suggested returning to neighborhood planning so that every area could have a locally developed plan.
Community Conversations and Written Input

Approach to Analysis

The input SF Planning received from community conversations and submitted letters during Phase II outreach was collected into a database. Each comment was read, reviewed, and coded by SF Planning staff to identify:

- Commentor’s organizational or professional affiliation (i.e. neighborhood association, D11, tenant rights organization, etc.)
- Topic (i.e. homeownership, homelessness prevention and elimination, etc.)
- Lived identity or geography referenced in the comment (i.e. Black community, seniors, extremely low-income households, etc.)
- Relevant draft Housing Element 2022 Update goals, policies, and actions
- Does it reinforce or critique draft goals, policies, or actions?
- Does it suggest an idea not already in the draft Housing Element 2022 Update?
- Does it recommend a modification to a draft goal, policy, or action?

Once coded, SF Planning staff analyzed comments to identify the most frequently discussed topics, the main takeaways, and points of agreement and dissent between comments themselves and between comments and the draft 2022 Update. This analysis process also noted the identity or organizational affiliation of commentors in order to highlight when communities were commenting on lived experiences or issues directly impacting them. The findings from this analysis are summarized below.

Input Overview

Summary: In conversations held with community groups and written comments received by SF Planning, community members expressed a wide variety of opinions related to housing production, community engagement, neighborhood life and resources, and other topics covered in or relevant to the 2022 Update. Community members most frequently spoke about housing production and increased density and were overwhelmingly in support of new housing in some form. This support, however, was nuanced. Commentators also raised questions about the neighborhood resources and infrastructure, the percentage of affordable housing, how communities will be equitably engaged during the production of developments, and other concerns and suggestions summarized in the following section.

HOUSING PRODUCTION AND DENSITY

Across almost all comments and groups, community members expressed the urgency for more housing. Calls for more housing came from not only organizations dedicated to housing and urban development, such as YIMBY Action and SPUR, but also community-based organizations and homelessness advocates, including Senior Disability Action (SDA) and Homeless Emergency Services Provider Association (HESPA). While the 2022 Update must accommodate for new housing to meet projected needs, community members contributed other reasons why they wanted to increase housing stock. These reasons included to reduce housing prices, house unhoused residents and those currently unable to live in San Francisco, and to improve neighborhood life and amenities.

Expectedly, community members expressed a wide range of opinions and suggestions for achieving greater housing production and density. Advocates and specialists at YIMBY Action and SPUR supported the streamlining of the development review and permitting process that SF Planning, Department of Building Inspection, and other city departments oversee. Specific suggestions included reforming and reducing the discretionary review process and expanding streamlining reform to all housing projects including housing developments not included in the first 2022 Update draft. Streamlining, respondents argued, would help prevent delays and reduce
construction costs, especially for smaller developers, and allow more housing units to be constructed more quickly and cost effectively.

Other community-based organizations were not in support of streamlining. Organizations such as the Race and Equity in all Planning Coalition (the REP coalition), Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association, and San Francisco Land Use Coalition raised concerns about the reduction of public engagement opportunities if the development review process is streamlined through discretionary review reform. Such a reduction, they argued, would be particularly detrimental to communities of color and those facing gentrification. Commentators argued that pre-identified community benefits, another potential streamlining approach, would similarly reduce community involvement and leverage in the planning of development. Instead, they wanted the 2022 Update to recommend greater community engagement. If streamlining were to be implemented, the REP coalition argued that these benefits should be limited only to affordable housing developers.

Representatives from the REP coalition, SDA, and the SF Land Use Coalition also disputed the belief that increasing any and all housing production would lead to an increase in housing affordability. The REP coalition and other community members pointed to the underproduction of housing units affordable to low-income households compared to the overproduction of luxury housing units according to past RHNA targets. They argued that market-rate housing production contributes to displacement of existing, low-income residents and exacerbates the housing affordability crisis.

In the first draft of the 2022 Update, many proposed policies and actions emphasized the role of rezoning to allow for greater housing density to facilitate housing production. This suggestion resonated positively with many community members. A wide range of organizations, including YIMBY Action, SDA, Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association, SPUR, Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association, and Larkin Street Youth Services, expressed support for policies that increased density. They called out low-density neighborhoods with high rates of single-family homes, such as the Sunset and Richmond, as appropriate candidates for rezoning and future development.

Respondents believed that these neighborhoods were not only ideal locations for future housing development not only for their existing low density, but because many of these same neighborhoods had access to high-quality resources, transportation, and community amenities. Advocates affiliated with YIMBY Action, many of which lived in these neighborhoods, welcomed housing development in their neighborhoods to share access to transit, parks, and highly rated schools especially for underserved households. A youth advocated with Larkin Street Youth Services agreed that affordable housing production should take place away neighborhoods with high instances of street drug usage and crime to provide a more stable environment for vulnerable households. Policy specialists at SPUR suggested that new developments in low-density neighborhoods should be large, high-density developments in order to maximize production on a limited number of parcels available and appropriate at any one time.

While still expressing support for new housing opportunities, advocates affiliated with the Homeless Emergency Services Provider Association (HESPA) and MegaBlack expressed concern about the re-entrenching of inequities that could result from housing investments and development made in already high-income, well-resourced neighborhoods. Advocates affiliated with SPUR added that housing development in vulnerable communities can be a stabilizing force. Community-based organizations SDA and the Tenderloin People’s Congress stressed that they welcomed more affordable housing construction to serve low-income residents and wanted them built in communities like the Tenderloin, Mission, and Castro.

Respondents also highlighted corridors with existing, high-quality transit services as ideal locations for increased density and housing production. A subset of community organizations, including the REP coalition, SDA, and the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters, added that housing production along transit corridors should primarily or wholly be affordable housing. They argued that communities of color and low-income households were the most likely demographics to utilize and be reliant on public transit. As such, they would benefit the most from access to public transit and housing production along these corridors should prioritize their needs.
While the majority of community organizations supported housing production and density in some form, a few residents expressed concerns about rapid change in the community, a desire to continue to preserve neighborhoods’ distinctive architectural style, and the maintenance of existing light and air access requirements.

**EQUITY-CENTERED PROCESSES AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

One of the most frequently discussed topics was SF Planning’s community engagement process. The 2022 Update’s focus on equity invited specific and detailed comments about SF Planning’s actions, outreach, and engagement have harmed its reputation and trust from the community.

Black community leaders affiliated with MegaBlack told Planning staff that their community had been deeply harmed by the city’s past actions, such as at the hands of the Redevelopment Agency. They told staff they had not seen action specifically benefitting the Black community in previous projects and expressed doubt that this instance would be different. Moreover, they indicated that the outreach process SF Planning implemented to collect feedback from MegaBlack was retraumatizing and extractive itself. While hopeful for change and inclusion, respondents shared their disappointment and frustration that SF Planning only engaged them when public input was needed and did not provide feedback and communication back to them. These frustrations were also shared by many residents at an in-person Community Conversation held by SF Planning in Bayview-Hunters Point.

MegaBlack advocates attributed part of this loss of trust to a lack of cultural competency in SF Planning’s outreach. They called on SF Planning to hire more Black planners, community historians, and staff. It was important to them that the SF Planning staff they interacted with had a shared cultural background and lived experiences in order to trust that staff would be an advocate for their interests and needs within the department.

Residents at the Bayview-Hunters Point Community Conversation added that many of SF Planning’s materials and outreach were inaccessible to the average resident because of their usage of technical terminology and “educated White” language. This made it difficult to understand, resonate with, and respond to SF Planning.

Similarly, the REP coalition expressed skepticism that SF Planning was genuine in its stated goals of equity drafted in the 2022 Update. They stated concerns that SF Planning’s outreach tokenized community input rather than meaningfully incorporated it to share decision-making power with marginalized communities that comprised their coalition.

A major point of contention for organizations associated with the REP coalition was the usage of high-opportunity and vulnerable geographies in the first draft of the 2022 Update. These categories, developed by SF Planning based on variables like income, racial demographics, and in coordination with departments like the Department of Public Health, refer to neighborhoods rich with high-quality community resources and marginalized neighborhoods made vulnerable through underinvestment and displacement, respectively. Advocates with the REP coalition disputed that these geographies had not been chosen by and vetted by vulnerable communities. An organizer with HRC added that it felt that SF Planning was making judgements on which neighborhoods residents should live in with these categories.

As part of the process of earning trust with the community, community members indicated that they needed more forms of accountability from SF Planning in delivering goals outlined in the 2022 Update. This was especially important to commentators because of a lack of perceived action and progress from SF Planning in the past. The Latino Task Force wanted to see a timetable for implementation included in the 2022 Update that they could hold the city accountable to. The SF League of Conservation Voters and HRC suggested that SF Planning publish an annual progress report on the Housing Element’s goals or tracking the enrollment of low-income families in below-market rate (BMR) housing units.

REP coalition advocates pointed out SF Planning’s budget’s reliance on permit and development fees created a conflict of interest between SF Planning and developers. While supportive of a progress report or other public tracking of progress, they insisted that the metrics used to determine the equity of a policy or action should be defined by directly impacted communities.
EQUITABLY RESOURCED, VIBRANT, AND WALKABLE NEIGHBORHOODS

Respondents not only shared their opinions and priorities on housing, but made clear that neighborhood infrastructure, amenities, and resources were essential to supporting their neighborhoods.

The most frequently shared priority was for public open spaces and parks. Community members were interested in seeing more rooftop gardens and other innovative green spaces incorporated into new and existing housing developments. The REP coalition added that privately operated public open spaces (POPOS) do not sufficiently serve communities of color and new proposed housing developments should be analyzed to ensure they do not cast shadows on existing parks.

Another top priority was a need for access to hospitals and medical services. Community members affiliated with HRC, SDA, and Larkin Street Youth Services all mentioned the importance of medical services in their neighborhood for seniors, disabled people, and unhoused residents.

In weighing investments across neighborhoods, some community members expressed concerns about further entrenching neighborhood inequities. They urged that neighborhood investments be equitably distributed across neighborhoods and spoke against building housing only in well-off communities that already had high-quality public amenities. For example, the REP coalition did not support incentivizing new housing in near highly rated schools and instead called for lower-performing schools to be invested in equitably so that they could also become high quality.

The SF Land Use Coalition broadly advised that neighborhood improvements to transit, open green spaces, and other public amenities should be planned and directed by vulnerable local residents. They must also be paired with anti-displacement measures like tenant protections.

A few community stakeholders associated with the OMI Community Collaborative, Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association, and Nancy Wuerfel shared concerns about public infrastructure such as sewage, water, and roads being able to support the proposed amount of development in the draft 2022 Update.

PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRODUCTION AND FUNDING

Community stakeholders expressed ideas and concerns not only about general housing production, but specifically producing affordable housing.

SF Planning staff heard broad support from a variety of community stakeholders for greater public investment and intervention for affordable housing. A community member affiliated with YIMBY Action pointed to council houses, a form of social housing, in the United Kingdom as a positive example we should model our housing off. Another affiliated with the Latino Task Force encouraged the city to acquire SROs, empty hotels, and empty lots for affordable housing development. With any public sites, advocates with the REP coalition asserted that any housing developed on them should be 100% affordable.

The REP coalition also spoke more broadly against the privatization of public and publicly funded housing. They were opposed to a policy in the first draft of the 2022 Update that sought to address the impediments to large, entitled developments that could not proceed with construction. Instead, they over-reliance on the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) and Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) programs for affordable housing funding on the basis that they expanded the privatization of affordable housing production. A community member with Miraloma Park Improvement Club added that the 2022 Update should focus on working with non-profit developers to provide affordable housing units instead of relying on for-profit developers to deliver these options.

To support this affordable housing development, commentators provided funding and sourcing suggestions. Community members with SDA suggested creating a disabled operating subsidy, similar to the existing senior operating subsidy (SOS) program, to create accessible housing options for disabled people regardless of their age.

The REP coalition advocated for the expansion of local approaches and funding sources to support affordable housing development. These included support for the Bay Area Financing Authority’s proposal for a regional progressive tax to fund affordable housing, land banking, a vacancy tax on second or vacation homes, and a tax on speculative resale of housing.
One existing strategy for affordable housing production is an inclusionary affordable unit requirement levied on market-rate housing projects. However, developers also have the option to pay an in-lieu fee to fund affordable housing off-site if they do not want to host those below market-rate units on-site. Community members from both the REP coalition and the Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association encouraged the 2022 Update to include policies to encourage developers to build those BMR units on-site instead of paying the fee.

As a way to maintain and create affordable housing from existing housing stock, some stakeholders expressed support for community land trusts (CLTs), limited-equity cooperatives, and other forms of alternative and collective ownership.

**EQUITABLE ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING RESOURCES**

In addition to affordable housing production, community members submitted comments on how existing affordable housing resources should be equitably dispersed. Many commentators shared that they felt that the current income and other eligibility requirements excluded many households in need of affordable housing. Commentators that emphasized this point included a broad variety of community members affiliated with SDA, Latino Task Force, HRC, HESPA, BMAGIC, MegaBlack, Larkin Street Youth Services, and the REP coalition.

Building on this, community members shared that existing affordable housing income eligibility requirements were too narrow. This excluded both households on the lower end of the spectrum — extremely low-income households and those on fixed incomes, such as seniors and people with disabilities, of below 0-15% of AMI — and the middle of the spectrum — households that are marginally over the income requirements. SF Planning staff also heard that applications themselves were too strict, making applying for affordable housing difficult for gig, seasonal, and informally employed workers who may not have paperwork to prove their income or have incomes that fluctuate. Youth and TAY advocates affiliated with Larkin Street Youth Services shared that TAY housing limited eligibility to single adults, which excluded married TAY and TAY with children.

As part of the correction of these problems and to more equitably distribute affordable housing resources, commentators suggested implementing a lottery preferences or priority for certain groups. These suggestions included lottery priority for:

- Residents in the geography the development is being built in first (HRC)
- Workers of large institutions like schools or hospitals for affordable housing near their institution (Latino Task Force)
- Residents with generations of residency (a.k.a. “legacy families”) or have been in San Francisco for a long time themselves (Bayview-Hunters Point Community Conversation)
- Working-class San Franciscans in order to reduce the number of long commutes (HRC)

The REP coalition advocates pointed out, however, that the neighborhood preference program, an existing lottery priority system for residents applying for BMR units within their neighborhood, is not sufficient to serve neighborhoods and prevent displacement. They argue that few developments are required to actually implement a neighborhood preference program because this program is only triggered at developments of 10 or more units. They added that the city should monitor and enforce a racial equity metric to ensure that the demographics of lottery winners match those of the surrounding neighborhood.

The topic of lottery priorities also revealed tensions between marginalized groups in accessing scarce affordable housing resources. A community member speaking at the Bayview-Hunters Point Community Conversation expressed frustration that Latino/e/x and Asian residents seemed to be dominating affordable housing lotteries, presumably at the cost of access for other racialized groups. Another community member with the Tenderloin People’s Congress requested that the city differentiate between Black non-Hispanic/Latino and Black Hispanic/Latino residents in tracking and assigning lottery priorities, reflecting a similar tension between affordable housing applicants.

Not all community stakeholders were in agreement that lottery priorities were an appropriate strategy to
address inequity. A community member with North Beach Neighbors argued that the city should not look at just race and ethnicity in implementing housing priorities.

Commentators also suggested that the city expand its outreach and education around affordable housing resources in order to improve equitable access to these resources. According to input from community members, information on affordable housing resources is not centralized, hard to locate, and difficult to understand. They recommended that MOHCD commit more funding to community outreach and education on DAHLIA, the city’s affordable housing application program, and to fund neighborhood groups and liaisons to promote this information within their communities.

REP coalition advocates emphasized that the main barrier to accessing affordable housing, however, was not information and awareness but cost.

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC MOBILITY

Homeownership was a frequent and high-priority topic for many community stakeholders, but especially so for Black residents and organizations.

To Black advocates affiliated with BMAGIC and MegaBlack, facilitating and subsidizing homeownership was seen as a potential form of reparations, an opportunity to build intergenerational wealth, increase economic mobility, and a way to bring back displaced Black households.

In addition to buying homes, commentators said that current Black homeowners also need funding and support for ongoing home repairs. More broadly, organizations like HRC, the REP coalition, and the Latino Task Force indicated that many low-income homeowners needed support in paying high homeowners association (HOA) fees at BMR units in otherwise market-rate developments.

Some community members supported a rent-to-own program that might allow low-income households an opportunity for homeownership.

REP coalition advocates cautioned the 2022 Update should include policies that ensure the long-term affordability of homes for subsequent owners as well. They argued that homes should not be treated as vehicles of wealth accumulation. Otherwise, this could exacerbate housing speculation and contribute to the ongoing housing affordability crisis.

REPARATIONS

In response to immense wealth and land seized by the city from racialized and marginalized communities, including but not limited to Black residents, advocates with MegaBlack requested the city conduct a survey of the wealth taken from the Black community during redevelopment.

COMMUNITY STABILITY AND TENANT PROTECTIONS

Community stakeholders were also concerned with maintaining existing communities and preventing future displacement. To serve that goal, stakeholders called upon the city to better enforce and fund existing tenant protection programs. This request included more effectively regulating intermediate-length occupancy housing units, protecting units and tenants impacted by demolitions per SB 330, and fully fund and expand the eligibility of the right to counsel program to all tenants regardless of income.

Community members from SDA, HRC, Larkin Street Youth Services, HESPA, and the REP coalition all also supported rental subsidies for tenants as both an anti-displacement and homelessness prevention measure. Some advocates specified that rent should be subsidized to 33% of a tenant’s income for it to be effectively affordable for the recipient. REP coalition advocates warned, however, that rental subsidies should not be used as a long-term housing affordability strategy and argued that they act as subsidies for private landlords.
Digital Participation Platform

Approach to Analysis

SF Planning received feedback in the following forms through the Digital Participation Platform: degree of agreement or disagreement of policies through a Likert Scale, support or opposition to actions, and open comments. Quantitative feedback was summarized using a numbers processing program. Qualitative feedback, each of the open comments, was read, reviewed, and coded by SF Planning staff to identify:

- Topic (i.e., homeownership, homelessness prevention and elimination, etc.)
- Relevant draft Housing Element 2022 Update goals, policies, and actions
- Does it reinforce or critique draft goals, policies, or actions?
- Does it suggest an idea not already in the draft Housing Element 2022 Update?
- Does it recommend a modification to a draft goal, policy, or action?

Once coded, SF Planning staff analyzed comments to identify the most frequently discussed topics, the main takeaways, and points of agreement and dissent between comments themselves and between comments and the draft Housing Element. The findings from this analysis are summarized below.

Input Overview

Summary: The digital participation platform allowed the public to comment with great specificity on the draft 2022 Update, including at the policy and action levels of the Housing Element. Below the feedback is presented accordingly, followed by a summary of comments organized by common themes.

POLICIES

The digital participation platform included 49 draft policies for input. Each policy received an average number of 19 responses, and the median number of responses was 18. Policy 1.1, “Expand permanently supportive housing and services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness,” received the most responses of all policies, with a total of 52
Figure 14. Responses to All Policies on DPP
**Policy I.1:** Expand permanently supportive housing and services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

**Policy I.2:** Increase shelters and temporary housing, in proportion to permanent solutions, including necessary services for unhoused populations.

**Policy I.3:** Affirmatively address the racial and social disparities among people experiencing homelessness by ensuring equitable access to shelter or housing for American Indian, Black, families with children, seniors, LGBTQ+, pregnant women, veterans, people with disabilities, and those suffering from mental health and substance abuse issues.

**Policy I.4:** Prevent homelessness for people at risk of becoming unhoused including people with previous experiences of homelessness, living without a lease, families with young children, pregnant, formerly incarcerated, or with adverse childhood experiences.

**Policy I.5:** Prevent eviction of residents of subsidized housing or residential Single Room Occupancy (SRO) hotels.

**Policy I.6:** Elevate direct rental assistance as a primary strategy to secure housing stability and reduce rent burden.

**Policy I.7:** Preserve affordability of existing subsidized housing, government, or cooperative owned housing where the affordability requirements are soon to expire.

**Policy I.8:** Preserve the remaining affordable Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units as a housing choice for the extremely and very low-income households.

**Policy I.9:** Minimize evictions for both no-fault and at-fault eviction through tenant rights education and counseling, eviction defense, mediation, and rental assistance programs.

**Policy I.10:** Eliminate discrimination and advance equal housing access based on race, ethnicity, immigration status, HIV+, LGBTQ+, and people with disabilities, or prior incarceration.

**Policy I.11:** Improve access to the available Below Market Rate units especially for Vulnerable Groups.

**Policy I.12:** During emergencies, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, earthquakes or fires, allow for emergent policies that address housing insecurity and economic hardship.

**Policy II.1:** Reframe the narrative of housing challenges to acknowledge and understand the discrimination against Communities of Color as a root cause for disparate outcomes.

**Policy II.2:** Embrace the guidance of community leaders representing American Indian, Black, and other People of Color throughout the planning and implementation of housing solutions.

**Policy II.3:** Amplify and prioritize voices of American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in the City’s engagement processes.

**Policy II.4:** Measure racial and social equity in each step of the planning process for housing to assess and pursue ways to achieve beneficial outcomes for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color.

**Policy II.5:** Bring back People of Color displaced from the city by strengthening racial and cultural anchors and increasing housing opportunities in support of building wealth.

**Policy II.6:** Prioritize health improvement investments within Environmental Justice Communities to ensure that housing reduces existing health disparities.

**Policy III.1:** Eliminate community displacement of American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in Priority Geographies.

**Policy III.2:** Expand investments in Priority Geographies to advance equitable access to resources while ensuring community stability. Policy III.3: Prioritize the City’s acquisition and rehabilitation program to serve Priority Geographies and neighborhoods with higher rates of eviction and displacement.

**Policy III.4:** Increase homeownership opportunities for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color especially within Priority Geographies to allow for wealth building and reversing historic inequities within these communities.

**Policy III.5:** Ensure equitable geographic distribution of new multi-family housing throughout the city to reverse the impacts of exclusionary zoning practices and reduce the burden of concentrating new housing within Priority Geographies.
Policy III.6: Increase housing choice along Rapid bus and rail corridors and near major transit stops in High Opportunity Neighborhoods through zoning changes and streamlining approvals.

Policy III.7: Increase housing choice by allowing and facilitating small multi-family buildings in low-density areas within High Opportunity Neighborhoods.

Policy III.8: Enable low and moderate-income households particularly American Indian, Black, and other People of Color to live and prosper in High Opportunity Neighborhoods through increasing units that are permanently affordable.

Policy IV.1: Create a dedicated and consistent local funding stream and advocate for State and Federal funding to support building permanently affordable housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households that meets the Regional Housing Needs Allocation targets.

Policy IV.2: Maintain sufficient development capacity to respond to the increasing housing need and the scarcity of housing supply within San Francisco and the region.

Policy IV.3: Reduce development constraints such as high construction cost and lengthy City-permitting timeline to increase housing choices and improve affordability.

Policy IV.4: Maximize the number of permanently affordable housing units constructed through private development without public subsidy.

Policy IV.5: Maximize the use of publicly-owned sites for permanently affordable housing in balance with community infrastructure and facilities needed that can be accommodated on those sites.

Policy IV.6: Require new commercial developments and large employers, hospitals, and educational institutions to help meet housing demand generated by job growth.

Policy IV.7: Address the impediments to constructing approved housing that is already approved, especially large master plans and development agreements such as Treasure Island, Candlestick Park, Hunters Point Shipyard, Parkmerced, HOPE SF projects, Schlage Lock.

Policy IV.8: Maximize the use of existing housing stock for residential use by discouraging vacancy, short-term use, and speculative resale.

Policy IV.9: Preserve the affordability of unauthorized dwelling units while improving safety and habitability.

Policy IV.10: Encourage provision of the maximum number of units when existing housing stock is proposed for major expansions or demolition.

Policy V.1: Promote and facilitate aging in place for seniors and multi-generational living.

Policy V.2: Prevent the outmigration of families with children and support the needs of families to grow.

Policy V.3: Retain and increase the moderate- and middle-income households through building permanently affordable workforce housing.

Policy V.4: Facilitate small multi-family buildings as a prominent housing type that private development can deliver to serve middle-income households.

Policy V.5: Promote group housing as an entry-level housing option for moderate income households, particularly single-person households.

Policy V.6: Continue to support and expand the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) program.

Policy V.7: Strengthen homeownership programs to allow upward mobility for families.

Policy V.8: Create a dedicated and consistent local funding stream and advocate for State and Federal funding to support building permanently affordable housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households that meets the Regional Housing Needs Allocation targets.

Policy V.9: Preserve the affordability of unauthorized dwelling units while improving safety and habitability.

Policy V.10: Encourage provision of the maximum number of units when existing housing stock is proposed for major expansions or demolition.

Policy V.11: Promote and facilitate aging in place for seniors and multi-generational living.

Policy VI.1: Facilitate neighborhoods where proximity to daily needs promote social connections, support the City’s sustainability goals, and advance a healthy environment.

Policy VI.2: Ensure transportation investments and new housing are planned in parallel to advance well-connected neighborhoods and equitable access to transit.

Policy VI.3: Advance equitable access to high-quality amenities, and resources as part of a healthy and equitable environment and in parallel with planning for increased housing.

Policy VI.4: Advance equitable access to a healthy environment through improved air quality, and resilience to natural hazards and climate change impacts, particularly in Environmental Justice Communities.

Policy VI.5: Apply urban design principles to ensure that new housing enables neighborhood culture, safety, and experience, connects naturally to other neighborhoods, and encourages social engagement and vitality.

Policy VI.6: Sustain the dynamic and unique cultural heritage of San Francisco’s neighborhoods through the conservation of their historic architecture and cultural uses.
### Figure 15. Actions with Most Responses on DPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote: Up</th>
<th>Vote: Down</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1a</td>
<td>Facilitate building permanently supportive housing to house 5,000 unhoused households through annual budget for capital, operating and services funding.</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1f</td>
<td>Allow private development to satisfy their inclusionary requirements by providing permanent supportive housing.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1d</td>
<td>Utilize the State-wide streamlining opportunities to expedite and increase the production of permanent supportive housing.</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2b</td>
<td>Pursue zoning changes to increase development capacity that accommodates equitable distribution of growth throughout the city particularly in High Opportunity Neighborhoods and Priority Development Areas.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1b</td>
<td>Secure and advocate for additional State and federal funding for permanent supportive housing such as Project Homekey.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1e</td>
<td>Support tenant and project-based rental assistance programs, including federal, state and local operating subsidy programs.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1j</td>
<td>Strengthen the “Step up Housing” or housing ladder strategy to support formerly unhoused residents in moving to less-supportive settings, freeing up supportive housing for unhoused people.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1c</td>
<td>Create an implementation plan for the annual funding resulting from the new gross receipts tax to increase acquisition and construction of permanently affordable housing.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1g</td>
<td>Expand and improve supportive services within housing projects including sustained care for mental health of substance abuse issues, case management, and childcare.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3a</td>
<td>Expand the use of cost-efficient construction types such as modular and materials such as cross laminated timber.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Diagram:**

- **Vote UP**
- **Vote DOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action ID No.</th>
<th>Votes UP</th>
<th>Votes DOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1a</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1f</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1d</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2b</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1b</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1e</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1j</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1c</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1g</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3a</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
responses. The following table shows the top 10 policies on which people provided input and their results. The reader can see that the strongest agreement was shown for policies under Goal 4, “Increase housing production to improve affordability for the city’s current and future residents.” Few policies received a high proportion of “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” The two policies that participants expressed disagreement and strong disagreement for were Policy 5.7, “Strengthen homeownership programs to allow upward mobility for families,” and Policy 6.6, “Sustain the dynamic and unique cultural heritage of San Francisco’s neighborhoods through the conservation of their historic architecture and cultural uses.”

Eighteen (18) of 49 policies (37%) received a majority of either an Agree, Strongly Agree, Neutral, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree vote. Eleven (11) policies received a majority of Strongly Agree, six (6) policies received majority Agree, and one (1) policy (Policy 5.7: Strengthen homeownership programs to allow upward mobility for families) received a majority Disagree. Only eight (8) responses were received for Policy 5.2 to “Prevent the outmigration of families with children and support the needs of families to grow,” the lowest number of responses for all the policies. Modifications to the draft policies and actions will be based on the quality of feedback received, not necessarily the quantity. This means that even while some Policies and Actions received fewer comments, they are not assumed to be de-prioritized.

**ACTIONS**

Figure 15 shows the top 10 of 252 actions that received the most feedback on the digital participation platform. Action 1.1a received the most total votes, as well as the most votes in support. Most actions received more than 50% votes in support, with 40 of the 252 actions receiving more than 50% votes in opposition. Action V.6b received the most votes in opposition, with 61 respondents voting down, while Action III.5c received the most percentage votes in opposition, with 76% of its respondents voting down.

**COMMENTS**

Each policy received an average number of 9 comments. The five policies that elicited the most comments were 4.3, 1.1, 6.6, 3.5, and 3.6, drawing between 16 and 21 comments each.

**Cultural Heritage and Preservation**

Digital Participation Platform comments largely oppose the idea of further policies that encourage cultural heritage and preservation, particularly through architectural and aesthetic considerations. Some of the reasons behind this include the idea that preservation and design guidelines “stifle creation and growth” and “no longer align with our overarching climate action goals.”

**Homeless Elimination and Prevention**

DPP comments pertaining to the unhoused community strongly support the need to provide housing solutions. However, respondents were divided over prioritizing temporary housing or permanent solutions for housing people currently living without a home. Some people feel that there is a strong need for temporary shelter until permanent solutions come into place, while others feel that these solutions are inefficient and that resources need to prioritize permanent housing.

One response shared that the various policies around the unhoused community “indicates that no real policy has been thought out at the planning level that we are asked to opine on.” They suggest that the Planning Department work with experienced groups and coalitions, such as the Coalition on Homelessness Oversight Board, rather than approaching the public with so many policies from which to choose. Another comment suggested that acknowledging trade-offs through the 2022 Update could help people better prioritize the policy options: “Land use and budgeting is fundamentally about trade-offs and compromises. Everybody wants more funding for permanent supportive housing, but nobody wants to pay for it or cut anything else. There is no recognition of costs, compromises, or trade-offs.”

Along with shelter and housing, comments shared that the unhoused community should also have access to key tools, training, and services, including drug rehabilitation.
Diversity of Housing Types
One comment did not support the idea “lumping” communities across a variety of racial and social backgrounds into one policy, explaining that policies, housing types, and services need to be responsive to the needs of different communities: “I don’t love lumping Black or pregnant folks with those suffering from mental health and substance abuse issues. These are two separate communities with vastly disparate needs.”

DPP responses did not express strong support for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU’s) as a housing type and policy in the 2022 Update. These comments suggest that ADU’s are “frequently abused by wealthy owners,” “should be limited to owner-occupiers on the property,” and subject to stricter vacancy laws.

Housing Production
When the topic came to housing production, respondents agreed that San Francisco needs to produce more housing. The City should reduce barriers to housing production, either by offering incentives or reducing the number of steps a developer must take for project approval, such as simplifying the Planning Code, reassessing the existing process of environmental review, and allowing for more by-right development.

Market Rate and Affordable Housing
Although there was consensus around a need for more housing, comments varied around the affordability requirements of new housing. These comments primarily fell into two categories: 1) increasing the total number of housing units in San Francisco will help drive down costs and thus increase affordability, and 2) produce more housing, only if they are affordable, ideally 100%, especially on public land. Some commenters especially supported policies that will specifically maximize the number of affordable homes as opposed to a percentage. One respondent suggested that if San Francisco were to include housing policies that support market rate housing, these should only be allowed by “limiting up-zoning benefits to only owner-occupiers who remain 10 years.”

Priority Geographies and High Resourced Areas
Many respondents expressed concern over the use of “Priority Geographies.” Some found that the criteria for these boundaries was not clear, and others felt that actions should place an emphasis on need rather than by geography. A few comments suggested that zoning changes proposed for High Resourced Areas of San Francisco should be applied everywhere. For example, zoning and heights should be increased across the entire city, especially along transit corridors, rather than only in High Resourced Areas. Comments that supported this idea also suggest that Housing Element policies should aim for all of San Francisco’s neighborhoods to be vibrant, high resourced areas with businesses, schools, and high-quality infrastructure. If focusing on certain geographies, the Housing Element should include Chestnut, Union, and California Streets to the existing list of transit corridors.

Speaking to exclusionary zoning and the history of racist practices in planning, some respondents would like to see the Housing Element and its policies more explicitly name these root causes of the housing challenges we face today. These comments also oppose producing more housing in areas that have faced and are currently facing environmental injustices, and instead to build in areas historically exclusively built for white people, such as the western neighborhoods of San Francisco.

RHNA Targets
Many DPP commenters did not feel like proposed Housing Element policies aim high enough for housing production in San Francisco. Rather than maintaining development capacity, one comment suggested that San Francisco should not just maintain, but expand development capacity. A few others suggested that the city should aim to exceed RHNA goals that were mandated of the city. At the same time, one respondent expressed that the policies related to RHNA goals need to be changed, as the housing targets “are excessive and do not take into account the infrastructure needs to provide a healthy lifestyle for this many residents.”

Equitably Resourced, Vibrant, and Walkable Neighborhoods
Whether commenting on Priority Equity Geographies or High Resourced Areas, commenters generally agreed that all areas of San Francisco should be accessible and thriving neighborhoods for all communities. Even so, some residents may prefer
certain areas “if their family, friends, community services, and language access are readily available in those areas,” requiring a nuanced approach.

Equity-Centered Processes and Community Engagement
Meaningful community engagement with all communities is important to respondents in developing the city’s policies. Communities, especially Black, American Indian, and other communities of color should be engaged early. Some comments suggested that while community engagement is critical and necessary, developers should not be required to independently engage for every project, so long as they follow a plan set by voices of the community. These need to be very clear community engagement processes and their outcomes “should be established and predictable at the outset” --not dependent on prolonged negotiations--in order to avoid the “appearance of corruption.”

Community leaders also may not be the most representative voices for their communities. For example, “while some leaders do indeed speak on behalf of their communities, others claim to speak for others without their consent/knowledge.” One suggestion similarly proposed that that “the City should not assume that the views of certain community leaders are more meritorious or deserving of respect than others.”

In contrast to comments that supported streamlined housing production, some respondents expressed that removing opportunities for public input in key areas, such as CEQA and discretionary review, is inequitable and lead to greater harm:

“CEQA law is important. It allows for public input and comment and should be in the planning process.”

“Deregulation always hurts low-income and working-class communities the most.”

Equitable Access to Affordable Housing Resources
Many comments suggested that policies should prioritize certain vulnerable communities, especially Black, American Indian, and other communities of color; we should not treat all groups as though they have the same experiences. At the same time, some respondents do not agree that policies should explicitly mention certain groups and find that this gives the impression that some vulnerable communities are more deserving than others. Similar to the focus on Priority Equity Geographies, some respondents would like to see policies apply to people based on need rather than by an identity or industry.

Suggestions for additional communities to be explicitly listed in Housing Element policies included Asians, healthcare workers, seniors, and small-scale landlords.

Permanently Affordable Housing Production and Investment
The DPP received a variety of suggestions on affordable housing programs. On funding for permanently affordable housing, one comment suggested setting a maximum budget in the 10-year Capital Plan, as opposed to a minimum, and another opposed raising taxes on San Francisco residents and businesses in order to fund. If taxpayer funds are to be used for permanently affordable housing programs, they should include extra credit points to incentivize developments that target higher than baseline code approaches with additional funding.

Regarding the amount of affordable housing included and density bonuses, some comments oppose policies that promote the State Density Bonus, as the program “does not provide enough affordable housing.” Others suggest that policies should explore a floating affordable percentage rate that is dependent on market conditions. And lastly, some comments suggest that the City should encourage use of the State Density Program and other incentivizing programs only if inclusionary requirements are increased, such as requiring 100% affordable housing, inclusion of extremely low income, and lower Homeowners Association fees.

Preservation of Affordability and Improving Conditions of Existing Housing
DPP comments on preservation of affordability and conditions of existing housing generally supported SROs as an option but would also like to add policies that offer greater support to the tenants, nonprofits, and small landlords. Comments reinforced the notion that SROs are small, unhealthy, and undesirable.
for people to live in, critically needing maintenance, cleaning, upgrades, and alternatives for living.

Some comments supported increasing capacity for nonprofits, community land banks, and small landlords to purchase and operate buildings with existing affordable housing, such as SROs, small sites, and heavily rent-controlled apartments.

**Community Stability and Tenant Protections**

Many comments regarding tenant protections shared support for small property owners and nonprofit providers. Some expressed that people who own property, whether as nonprofits or as individuals, should have the ability “to evict tenants who are abusive to their neighbors.” Small property owners should also receive incentives to rent out vacant units rather than punishment for not renting out.

"More restrictions on evictions make prices for everyone go up. Property owners need more control with what they can do with their properties. For those property owners who abuse the system, there should be consequences, but blanket policies don’t work."

DPP comments generally did not support rent control as a path toward community stability and tenant protections because “too many people who don’t need subsidies have rent control apartments.” Instead, one comment suggested that the City simply build more affordable housing where tenants are not vulnerable to eviction and speculation, and another suggested that direct rental assistance replace rent control: “This will unburden market rate tenants and smaller landlords from subsidizing people needing affordable housing.”

One comment shared support for rent control, such as extending rent control to the most recent allowable under law, by 15 years.

**City Family and Commissions**

**Commission Hearings**

The Planning Commission held two hearings regarding Draft 1 of the Housing Element 2022 Update, at the beginning and end of the outreach period. During the first hearing held on April 22, 2021, commissioners expressed positive opinions on the equity goals shared by project staff at that stage. Commissioners were more mixed in their attitudes towards the increased density proposed in the 2022 Update. They were unified in their directives to expand and support tenant protections, provide housing for extremely low-income and middle-income households, and to fully engage residents in the drafting of future policies and actions.

During the public comment portion, roughly half of commentators were members of the REP Coalition or expressed support for their comments. Comments affiliated with the REP Coalition principally expressed opposition to greater investment and incentivizing of private and market-rate development, demanded greater investment into 100% affordable housing for extremely low-income households, and to suspend and overhaul the 2022 Update’s proposed community engagement process. Other commentators spoke on a variety of other topics, such as calling for greater zoned density and housing production and more targeted policy support for communities vulnerable to displacement and housing insecurity, such as for seniors, people with disabilities, LGBTQ residents, and American Indian residents.

The second Planning Commission hearing on the Housing Element took place on October 14, 2021. Project staff presented findings from Phase II of outreach and potential policy updates. Commissioners expressed support for the implementation of the engagement process and its centering of marginalized communities. Some advocates affiliated with the REP coalition appeared again, reiterating their concerns about the community engagement process and criticizing Housing Element policies that relied on market-rate housing production. Half of the commentators identified themselves as participants in the Phase II focus groups. They all shared that their engagement experience had been welcoming and productive and supported the direction of the 2022 Update.
The Historic Preservation Commission also held one hearing on the 2022 Update on October 20, 2021. No members of the public offered comments. The commissioners were generally supportive of the draft policies and applauded this Housing Element’s novel focus on equity.

**Community Equity Advisory Council**

The Community Equity Advisory Council (Equity Council), a group of 11 community leaders convened by SF Planning to collaborate with the department on social and racial equity solutions, made the 2022 Update a topic of discussion at their June meeting. Project staff presented updates from Phase II outreach and collected feedback on draft Housing Element policies.

Project staff posed three questions to guide discussion:

- What are concrete actions to reverse inequities?
- How to guide location and type of future housing?
- How can we frame our housing policies for communities of color?

Equity Council leaders identified community stabilization strategies, including expanding rental assistance programs and limit zoning changes in communities of color, and long-term strategies to bring back and improve communities, including designating funding in communities of color towards housing, amenities, and infrastructure and anchoring households with homeownership opportunities, as concrete actions that could reverse inequities. Their recommendations for the location and type of housing largely aligned with strategies suggested in the draft Housing Element – directing new housing construction to neighborhoods with high incomes and low rates of development, less intense development to neighborhoods vulnerable to displacement, and small- and medium-sized housing for middle-income households of color. In order to serve communities of color, the Equity Council recommended the project staff frame the Housing Element to prioritize access to land and housing for all communities of color, invest in communities vulnerable to displacement, and identify the priority tasks for communities vulnerable to displacement.

In addition to responding to posed questions, Equity Council members responded generally to the Housing Element draft policies and actions. They recommended that future drafts of the Housing Element edit and incorporate edits to:

- **Support jobs and wealth in communities of color** – Stable, well-paying jobs allow communities of color to access housing, while homeownership is a way to maintain and pass on economic stability across generations. Small family businesses and light manufacturing zoning are key industries that can help support communities of color.

- **Make neighborhoods good places to live** – Connect residential spaces to services and culturally relevant activities and businesses.

- **Change legislation to address racial justice** – Change laws to allow for policies like priority for communities of color accessing housing to facilitate the return of displaced households.

- **Focus on retaining our housing in our neighborhoods** – Preserve existing housing through policies like acquisitions and rehabilitations.

- **Invest in communities of color and produce housing across all neighborhoods** – Support housing development and investment across all neighborhoods. Avoid policies that concentrate investments in well-resourced neighborhoods and pit neighborhoods against one another for funding.

- **Define timing of investments** – Specify different housing policies for different time lengths, such as streamlining housing developments in exclusive, white neighborhoods in the short-term and acquiring land for housing development and 100% affordable housing in the long-term.

- **Move towards collective ownership** – Support alternative ownership models, like community or collective ownership, that allows for whole communities to invest in housing, businesses, and other spaces.

- **Clarify equity, priorities and opportunities concepts** – Be precise and define language being used. Communicate these clearly to communities.
5. Conclusions

Approach to Synthesis

This phase of outreach sought to build upon the previous phase’s goal of centering the perspectives of communities excluded from outreach in previous Housing Element updates. This approach aims to serve the Housing Element 2022 Update’s overarching purpose of advancing racial and social equity through both its policies and its development. To that end, this report’s analysis of community input will take into consideration the demographics, self-defined identities, and lived experiences of participants in drawing conclusions and shaping future drafts of the Housing Element.

SF Planning staff were especially interested in engaging with and incorporating input from residents vulnerable to housing insecurity, previously and persistently harmed by discriminatory housing policies, and other marginalized groups. These special consideration groups include, but are not limited to: American Indian, Black, and other communities of color, those who are unhoused or at risk of becoming unhoused, extremely and very low-income households, seniors, people with disabilities, transitional age youth, LGBTQ+ residents, subsidized housing and Single Room Occupancy (SRO) hotel tenants, and formerly incarcerated residents. Staff spoke with residents from various parts of the city, including from Priority Equity Geographies, which hold higher concentrations of vulnerable populations, and from well-resourced neighborhoods, which are anticipated to see more housing growth over the next few decades.

SF Planning staff conducted targeted outreach to primarily engage these groups. As summarized in Chapter 4 Public Input Summary by Outreach Method, vulnerable residents comprised the vast majority of the focus groups and more than half of community conversation audiences, while other sources of input reflected higher proportions of high-income and White residents.

While all input will be taken into consideration, this report will consider each type of input differently. This approach to analysis will allow project staff to synthesize all the input collected to draw out trends and broad themes while centering perspectives from racialized and marginalized communities most impacted by displacement and housing insecurity. Feedback that reflects lived experience will be weighed most heavily, followed by expert opinion and general public comment. Lived experiences were most reflected in in focus groups. Expert opinion was reflected mostly in the Housing Policy Group, the Equity Council, and the Planning Commission. Each of these formats allowed commentators to more fully express their professional or lived experience expertise in deeper and longer conversations as compared to other outreach venues. Moreover, the focus groups and Equity Council were overwhelmingly comprised of community members representing communities vulnerable to displacement, a perspective essential to delivering on the goal of housing equity.

Feedback received in community conversations and as public comments during commission hearings was not only briefer, more varied, and more unstructured, but also represented audiences from across the city instead of solely targeting communities vulnerable to displacement. About 50% of groups engaged in the community conversations representing communities from Priority Equity Geographies and the remaining 50% from groups from well-resourced communities.

Comments collected on the digital participation platform (DPP) responded very specifically to draft policies and actions; however, SF Planning staff did not target input from any specific vulnerable communities with this method. As such, input collected on the DPP reflected an audience most comfortable accessing the platform – namely high-income, young, male, and White residents.
Importantly, while this report’s structure will pull out broad themes and compile input by groups of special consideration, it will attempt to avoid overgeneralizing opinions and create a misleading appearance of consensus. No group is a monolith. Even participants within a self-identified group expressed distinct and, at times, conflicting opinions. In the following section, the report details the most prevalent themes with an attempt to also present nuances and dissent.

**Community Directives for Policies and Actions**

Although SF Planning staff did not ask for agreement amongst the various groups that were engaged, there seems to be significant alignment amongst various participants about what needs to be done to address San Francisco’s housing crisis. The ideas expressed in the deeper discussions with focus group members were largely echoed by the housing experts in the Housing Policy Group, the various community leaders and advocates gathered in the community conversations, and, to a lesser extent, in the more varied input received online. The following section seeks to articulate the community directives that can be found in this large body of input in order to identify what the City is being asked to do and to revise the draft 2022 Update accordingly. The reader will recognize that certain themes appear as through lines across multiple directives, including racial and social justice through reparative actions and community empowerment. Below, each directive is described along with group-specific comments SF Planning staff heard.

1. **Restructure how resources are prioritized for residents suffering the greatest burden of vulnerabilities and those harmed and/or displaced by discriminatory government actions.**

There was broad agreement that our current systems of resource allocation (housing, funds, staffing, etc.) need to be restructured to prioritize: (1) residents suffering the greatest number of overlapping vulnerabilities and (2) residents displaced and/or harmed by discriminatory government actions. Participants identified a need for more nuanced data and program approaches to better track and ensure equitable outcomes for people of color and vulnerable groups.

Many American Indian and Black participants advocated for prioritization by race as an indicator of housing vulnerability and in recognition of the long history of government harm to their people. Repairing the harm of discrimination through housing policy was an approach also elevated by the Equity Council and HPG, both of whom pushed for the need for more specificity in the Housing Element about the actions required for successful implementation of reparative policies. Prioritization as a means of repairing past harm raised many questions in the discussions with MegaBlack, Bayview Hunters Point, and OMI participants, and other majority Black community groups about how to quantify the wealth stolen from Black people, who is accountable, how to repay what is owed to displaced people who do not want to return, how to ensure reparations designated by race go to “native” or “legacy” San Francisco families, and how homeownership could act as a form of repair. Importantly, advocacy for reparations in the specific context of redressing urban renewal actions by the Redevelopment Agency was heard in discussions with Japanese and Filipino residents as well as Black residents, who all share historic roots in the neighborhoods most impacted by these government actions.

Participants expressed some disagreement about what the best form of repair would be. Community members affiliated with MegaBlack, Bayview Hunters Point, and others argued that housing as a form of repair should come in the form of homeownership. In contrast, community members affiliated with the REP coalition were concerned about the long-term affordability of homes given as a form of reparations. Community members with SDA, the SF Land Use Coalition, and others, were more focused on delivering low-income rental housing to serve communities vulnerable to displacement and housing insecurity and did not speak directly to the issue of homeownership as a form of reparation.

Across conversations with Black, Chinese, Latino/e/x, senior, youth, people with disabilities and others, participants emphasized the need to change the housing lottery system to reflect a more just system of resident prioritization. This was reported in the focus groups and the community conversations. Not only did participants point to the cumulative burdens that should be weighed when assessing need, but they also identified other conditions that should be
considered, such as a resident’s proximity to new housing, resident’s employment at neighborhood-serving institutions (schools, hospitals, non-profits), and the resident’s historical and familial ties to the neighborhood.

2. Improve access to existing housing programs and financial resources through increased human contact, cultural humility, navigability, and educational outreach, and by creating alternatives to existing forms of means testing.

Participants, especially those speaking as residents navigating housing support systems rather than as housing experts, offered substantial feedback on both the need to and methods for improving access to housing resources. Various groups, from seniors, youth, and people with disabilities to LGBTQ+ residents to people of color, described interactions with affordable housing programs as being disempowering, leaving people feeling unheard, overwhelmed, exhausted, and powerless. Many participants spoke about the experience of being on housing waiting lists for years and decades with no follow-up or information.

Improved access for some marginalized groups, especially immigrant groups such as undocumented Latino/e/x residents, focused more on cultural humility and navigability of systems. Navigability and human contact in housing programs was emphasized by mental health service providers, youth, and others. Many agreed that improvements could be achieved by resourcing community hubs operated by local organizations, and this was especially advocated for in the conversations American Indian, Black and Chinese residents.

Participants wanted to see more housing resources centralized, easier to locate, and easier to understand. They would also like MOHCD to commit more funding to outreach and education on DAHLIA, both through their own staffing and through the funding of neighborhood groups and liaisons to promote information within the community.

Across conversations with Black, Chinese, Latino/e/x, senior, youth, people with disabilities, and others, participants emphasized the need to restructure the income brackets and other eligibility requirements used to target affordable housing as there was broad agreement that the brackets do not effectively target resources to extremely low-income or to middle-income households. This was also echoed by groups such as the Human Rights Commission, the REP coalition and Homeless Emergency Services Providers Association (HESPA).

3. Ensure dignified housing for current and displaced residents free from discrimination, overcrowding or substandard conditions, and with access to chosen community, cultural anchors, services and jobs.

Participants largely agreed on the qualities of dignified housing, both in terms of its physical qualities and the element of choice, such as the location or type of housing. Choice of location means that quality housing units must be distributed throughout the city and that all residential neighborhoods should offer quality amenities and infrastructure. And it means that residents that rely more heavily on immediate connections to their community, such as some members of the LGBTQ+ community and recent immigrant communities, should have access to housing that accommodates for social infrastructure.

Tenderloin residents and Latino/e/x Mission residents in particular spoke about the inhumane housing conditions that their communities are forced to endure. Others, including LGBTQ+ and youth participants emphasized the right to freedom from physical and mental abuse and noted that the informal systems that their communities rely on to secure housing are rife with discrimination and trauma. Shelters were not considered dignified housing by most participants, and they expressed a desire to prioritize the construction of permanent affordable housing over temporary shelter. Black residents from focus groups and advocates affiliated with SDA pointed out that dignified housing is affordable housing – housing that costs less than 33% of one’s income.

Many participants naturally connected providing dignified housing for all to the need for greatly increased production. This was echoed in forums from focus groups to developers to community-based organizations and advocates. Reasons given for increasing housing stock included to reduce housing prices, provide housing to unhoused residents and those currently unable to live in San
Francisco, and improve neighborhood life and amenities. Participants often spoke of the connection between dignified housing and quality neighborhood infrastructure, amenities, and resources. The Equity Council and others added that proximity to jobs must be considered. Many residents and organizations, like the SF Land Use Coalition and the REP coalition, cautioned that these improvements should be planned and directed by local residents and paired with anti-displacement measures.

Tenant protections were also advocated for in many forums as a means of ensuring dignified housing; however, there were concerns expressed from some online commenters about the use of rent control as a means of tenant protection because it does not target those most in need of affordable rent. Direct rental assistance to tenants was more broadly supported. Both the HPG and the Equity Council suggested that more actions should be developed to support tenant protections as a means of stabilizing communities, which will increase quality of life and access to dignified housing over time.

4. Promote the equitable distribution of housing across all parts of the city through increased public funding, rezoning, education, incentives and streamlining measures while ensuring that projects do not displace existing residents.

Soliciting feedback about the geographic distribution of housing elicited a range of responses and concerns, but there was consensus and much enthusiasm for the goal of ensuring that all neighborhoods in the city should contribute. Specifically, this meant that production on the west and north sides of the city should be increased. A wide range of organizations, including YIMBY Action, SDA, Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association, SPUR, Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association, Castro LGBTQ Cultural District, and Larkin Street Youth Services, expressed support for policies that increased density. They identified low-density neighborhoods with high proportions of single-family homes, such as the Sunset and Richmond, as appropriate candidates for rezoning and future development. While the REP coalition did not oppose equitable distribution of housing across the city, they did not support many of the methods proposed in the draft policies to achieve this and only expressed support the production of 100% affordable housing with permanent restrictions.

Some east and south side residents from the Black and Latino/e/x communities expressed reservations about what type of housing would be made available to them on the west side of the city and a concern that they would be “othered” by existing residents there. Some participants from MegaBlack spoke directly about a concern that policies would result in “ghettoizing” Black Americans in new affordable housing developments on the west side of the city. Large, high-density developments intended to maximize available space were considered undesirable by many Black residents for this reason. Other residents from the Chinese-language focus groups noted that Chinese-language outreach and services are concentrated in Chinatown, which makes it difficult for Chinese living outside of Chinatown to access them. First generation immigrants in the Latino/e/x community were more likely to express reservations about leaving the Mission neighborhood but felt that their children and grandchildren may benefit from and desire to live in the more highly resourced parts of the city.

Housing experts tended to focus more on how to achieve increased and more distributed housing, suggesting capacity-building for non-profit developers, targeting homeownership programs, and promoting family-sized units. They also recommended up-zoning ambitiously while increasing community education and engagement for new developments. Chinese participants in focus groups, particularly those already living on the west side of the city, shared an enthusiasm for more dense housing developments in high-resource neighborhoods. While still expressing support for new housing opportunities, advocates affiliated with the Homeless Emergency Services Provider Association (HESPA) and MegaBlack expressed concern about the re-entrenching of inequities that could result from housing investments and development made in already high-income, well-resourced neighborhoods. And, while the majority of community organizations supported housing production and density in some form, a few residents from less densely populated neighborhoods expressed concerns about rapid change in the community, a desire to continue to preserve neighborhoods’ distinctive architectural style, and the maintenance of existing light and air access requirements. Although some homeowners in the Richmond focus groups expressed concern that new housing could cast a shadow on to other properties, most participants agreed that there are
ways to mitigate such impacts through careful planning and early engagement of both the communities the housing is for and their future neighbors. Some Sunset focus group participants were concerned about blocking views on main corridors but supported more height on hills and along transit lines. Focus group participants from the western neighborhoods generally expressed concern that new affordable housing will be stopped by neighbors (“not in my back yard”).

Several groups, including YIMBY, the Latino Task Force, and residents from the LGBTQ+ and the Richmond focus groups advocated for the streamlining of approval processes for middle-income housing. On the other hand, residents from the Sunset focus group and the Miraloma Park Improvement Club expressed concern that streamlining disempowers low-income communities and communities of color, while empowering for-profit developers. The Sunset residents suggested that streamlining should only be available for smaller projects. Other participants expressed similar limited support for streamlining, such as the SF Land Use Coalition who opposed streamlining for any market-rate developments, but instead recommended prioritization of new housing with deep affordability. Also, the American Indian focus group participants supported a streamlined process for affordable housing and units that support multigenerational households. Members of SPUR stated that streamlining would not serve as an incentive for the private market to produce affordable housing and recommended a property tax benefit instead. They also stated that streamlining should be the goal for all housing projects to boost overall production. Lastly, the REP coalition was strongly opposed to streamlining the development process and instead advocated for more opportunities for public review of proposals.

5. Increase wealth building opportunities through homeownership, financial education, and job training for American Indian, Black and lower income residents.

A majority of participants spoke about San Francisco’s high cost of living. They identified better-paying jobs and wealth-building opportunities as ways to stabilize communities and stem displacement at the root. This issue was most strongly expressed in conversations with and about Black residents and youth, and it was elevated in consultation with the Equity Council. Residents in the majority Black resident focus groups noted that it is crucial to improve the housing system because the system itself traps low-income residents in a cycle of poverty – without a housing plan it is difficult to get a good job, and without a job it is not possible to afford housing. Groups including immigrants, transitional-aged youth, and seniors need more support finding stable income opportunities and funding for housing. For these communities, maintaining a steady income to cover the cost of living in San Francisco is particularly challenging due to experience requirements, language barriers, unresolved immigration status, and the seasonal or informal aspect of many of the jobs they can access. Job opportunities must also be facilitated by improved public transit options.

Furthermore, participants agreed with the need to increase financial support programs that can help communities of color and low-income communities build intergenerational wealth through homeownership. Participants urged the City to improve methods to disseminate information and provide educational opportunities for communities to learn about existing City resources and programs related to housing. They want programs to prioritize Black, American Indian, and low-income communities that include targeted down-payment assistance loans and grants. Many participants specified that communities of color should have access to financial support programs that give them priority to own in their communities. To Black advocates affiliated with BMAGIC and MegaBlack and focus group participants from Bayview Hunters Point, facilitating and subsidizing homeownership was seen as a potential form of reparations, an opportunity to build intergenerational wealth, increase economic mobility, and a way to bring back displaced Black households. On the other hand, REP coalition advocates, cautioned that treating homes as vehicles of wealth accumulation could exacerbate housing speculation and contribute to the ongoing housing affordability crisis. Of note, only one of the twenty-two REP coalition organizations targets service to the Black community and that organization does provide homeownership support.
6. Build the kind of housing that vulnerable communities want in their neighborhoods so that they have opportunities to stay connected to their history and culture.

Many participants from the focus groups and community conversations, who were predominantly people of color and other marginalized groups, would like to see affordable housing built in their communities so that they have an opportunity to stay connected to their history and cultural anchors. This was echoed by American Indian, Black, Latino/e/x, Chinese, Japanese, LGBTQ+ and other groups. Black residents in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood expressed a desire for family housing (3 bedrooms or more) with yards and privacy, sometimes citing townhouse style developments as good examples. Black focus group members in the OMI wanted to see mixed-income housing and low-rise building types, while mixed-income housing was criticized by some Bayview Hunters Point residents and LGBTQ+ residents as not fostering inclusive communities indicating that more work needs to be done to ensure that residents of all income levels and identities feel welcome. LGBTQ+ residents want to see greater density and height in the Castro specifically to allow for the community density required to sustain their community ties and culture.

Participants agreed that more housing in San Francisco means more density. But what is considered an acceptable new housing building height varied from 3-6 stories or more for western neighborhoods to 10-12 stories in central neighborhoods. Youth and LGBTQ+ groups, some Chinese residents in the Richmond and Sunset, and some housing expert groups like SPUR advocated for housing at the taller and denser end of the spectrum throughout the city.

Across all methods of input, people agreed that housing types need to be responsive to the needs of different communities. Seniors and people with disabilities strongly advocated for accessible and supportive housing models that facilitate residents’ independence and quality of life. Transitional aged youth spoke about the need for housing for students or people just starting in the work force who may need additional support services. Some groups, include the Ramaytush Ohlone tribal consultants and Japanese focus groups and some seniors, spoke about the need for housing types that support communal style households, with shared amenities for cooking, socializing, recreation, childcare, and other needs. This type of housing was described as supporting more village style housing that allow for stronger social supports and intergenerational connections. The REP coalition rejected strategies that encourage new group housing such as described by the groups above until there is an inclusive, BIPOC and low-income community-led conversation about what group housing actually is and its impacts on communities.

7. Create accountability in policy making and empower residents to share decision-making for housing programs and project approvals.

Across the board, but particularly among communities of color and other marginalized groups, participants wanted to see existing housing programs, including the affordable housing lottery, public housing, and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing-sponsored programs, reformed to provide accountability and transparency to address a widespread loss in trust. They told project staff that programs should offer results, follow deadlines, audits, adequate oversight, regular reporting, and should face consequences for negligence in case management. The Equity Council provided specific direction to develop a housing portal, track community impacts, and to prepare data to address the failures of public housing projects and policies of the past. With more knowledge of the functions and performance of housing programs and policies and means to hold agencies accountable, communities of color and other marginalized groups aim to hold greater power in the decisions that affect them.

Participants, including many from the Black community in the Bayview Hunters Point, pointed to the need for structural changes to allow for this sharing of power with city agencies. They named more representation of communities of color among city staff, in community advisory groups, and other forums to achieve this change. The impact of greater representation was also reflected in the fact that participants provided greater input when conversations were hosted and facilitated by members of their own community. By including these communities in
decision-making, the city is better able to understand and address how systemic racism, discriminatory policies, and economic inequality contribute to the housing crisis.

Members of the HPG and others expressed concern that the City may not be ready to make changes. The implementation of this Housing Element would fail without such change and HPG members asked for greater specificity in the 2022 Update on how accountability and community empowerment will be achieved.

Participants also connected the need for greater knowledge and inclusion to an increased need for community engagement. The type of engagement desired was largely described as community-led, culturally appropriate, long-term, and with clear expectations about the outcome of the engagement. Many residents, especially those in Bayview Hunters Point and those represented at MegaBlack, spoke about the lack of follow-up after City engagement efforts and perceived lack of action in response to the concerns shared. This has led to greater suspicion of the City’s engagement efforts and has engendered engagement exhaustion. Black community members frequently described feelings of exhaustion and re-traumatization that has resulted from constant outreach from multiple city agencies, heightened because they feel that their input has little or no impact on the City’s actions.

8. Further study the equity impacts of market-rate housing production on American Indian, Black and other communities of color and vulnerable residents, and apply those findings to stop the displacement of these groups.

A consistent question about the impact of market-rate housing on housing affordability generally and residential displacement specifically arose in conversations with residents, housing advocates and housing policy experts. Participants in the LGBTQ+, youth, and Filipino focus groups and in some of the broader community conversations with Latino Task Force, Blaze Youth Fellows, and Housing Rights Committee talked about the struggle of achieving affordability within an economic model that treats housing as a commodity rather than a right. Representatives from the REP coalition, SDA, and the SF Land Use Coalition also disputed the belief that increasing any and all housing production would lead to an increase in housing affordability. The REP coalition and other community members pointed to the underproduction of housing units affordable to low-income households compared the overproduction of luxury housing units according to past RHNA targets. They argued that market-rate housing production contributes to displacement of existing, low-income residents and exacerbates the housing affordability crisis. Some online respondents would like to see the Housing Element and its policies more explicitly name these root causes of the housing challenges we face today.

Other participants felt that market rate housing needs to be built for higher income groups, but that affordable housing production must be prioritized. It was suggested in the focus groups and by the Latino Task Force to cap the number of market-rate units that are allowed to be built and take steps to remove profit-incentive from housing. Still others, such as YIMBY, advocated for increased market-rate housing production as one solution for achieving better affordability by increasing the volume of available units and as a means of bringing privately funded amenities to neighborhoods. Others, such as SPUR, spoke to the need to reduce housing cost production overall, while still utilizing market rate housing and inclusionary housing programs to incrementally add to affordable housing stock.

While there was not agreement among participants in the assumptions of how market-rate housing affects affordability, participants from many groups including communities of color, seniors, youth and various levels of housing expertise called for the need to study the equity impacts of market-rate housing production on American Indian, Black and other communities of color and vulnerable residents. There was interest in research at a citywide level to understand broader patterns of housing inequity and policy outcomes, but also at the project level to study impacts to the immediate neighborhood population. While many participants did not link market-rate housing production to the displacement of vulnerable residents, others believe that there is a strong correlation and that the impacts must be addressed in order to stop residential displacement.
Policy Responses to Community Directives

The community directives served the revision of the 2022 Housing Element Update in two key ways: they helped to affirm existing components that are required to advance equity in housing, and they revealed gaps that required bolstering with new or modified policies and actions. Below, the larger shifts that occurred between Draft 1 and 2 in response to community input are described. Please note that all references to policies and actions are related to the second draft of the 2022 Update. For a more detailed mapping of how the 2022 Update draft changed and how the changes respond to the community directives listed above, please refer to the Revised Policy and Action Table in Appendix H.

What was Affirmed

The goals articulated in Draft 1 of the 2022 Update were widely supported by groups across the board, from residents to commissioners. Therefore, these remain essentially unchanged in Draft 2. Policies and actions that already correlated strongly with the community directives were retained, including but not limited to:

- Expanding resources for people experiencing homelessness and the people most vulnerable to housing insecurity.
- Better utilizing the City’s acquisition and rehabilitation program.
- Preserving the affordability of existing units of all types, including unauthorized units.
- Improving access to Below Market Rate units.
- Investigating and eliminating discrimination in housing.
- Cultivating spaces of cultural importance for communities impacted by displacement.
- Amplifying and prioritizing voices of people of color.
- Enabling low and moderate-income households to live and prosper in well-resourced neighborhoods.

What was Changed

Certain ideas presented as policies in Draft 1 of the 2022 Update were affirmed by strong public support but required strengthening to better convey their importance. These ideas were elevated as a new layer of objectives in Draft 2 so that they function as a guide for multiple policies and actions and provide more clarity about how the city can reach its housing goals.

Many of the substantial changes at the policy and action level of the 2022 Update are intended to bolster or refine the ideas expressed in these objectives. Approximately half of the policies and actions were either added or significantly modified to fill these gaps. Policy or action ideas were only removed entirely in a few instances as further analysis proved that they were not directly supporting the goals and objectives of the housing plan.

The following analysis broadly outlines how the second draft of the 2022 Update responds to community directives described in the previous section.

1. RESTRUCTURE HOW RESOURCES ARE PRIORITIZED

The restructuring and reframing of housing prioritization are largely addressed by new and modified policies and actions supporting the following goals:

Goal 1. Recognize the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic stability.

Goal 2. Repair the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination for American Indian, Black, and other people of color.

As previously noted, two through lines intersect with many of the community directives described above: the need for racial and social justice through reparative actions and the need for community
empowerment. In response, Draft 2 contains more explicit reparative framing of policies and actions that are intended to redress past discriminatory government actions, such as homeownership programs (Policy 11). It also includes policies to identify populations underserved in the Below Market Rate program and strategies to better serve underserved populations (Policy 5) including those who have been waiting on the lottery for more than five years (Policy 5, Action d). Furthermore, more actions were created to bolster the existing policies that support the prioritization of the most vulnerable groups in housing programs (Policy 8, Actions b, e, f, j-m; Policy 2, Actions b, d, g, h).

2. INCREASE ACCESS TO HOUSING RESOURCES

Assistance navigating housing resources was called for by many groups. Draft 2 addresses these concerns by increasing and refining policies related to housing program outreach, education, counseling, and case management (Policy 1, Action l; Policy 7; Policy 8, Action l). In order to better understand barriers to housing and discrimination in the system, the revised draft also calls for a study to identify common cases of discrimination and implement solutions to strengthen enforcement of fair housing law (Policy 6, Action b). The revisions also added supporting actions to the existing policy to “improve access to the available Below Market Rate units especially for racial and social groups who have been disproportionately underserved” (Policy 5).

3. ENSURE DIGNIFIED HOUSING

The need for safe and dignified housing is more explicitly addressed in new policies supporting health and environmental justice (Policy 34). Also, in recognition of the connection between dignity and choice highlighted in the community input, Draft 2 expands policies related to building more affordable housing in places that vulnerable communities need them. This includes a policy to pursue investments in permanently affordable housing that are specific to neighborhoods that serve as entry points to recently arrived residents from certain groups, such as LGBTQ+ refugees or immigrants, or specific to populations such as transitional aged youth or transgender people (Policy 2).

4. PROMOTE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING

Several new policies are intended to better support the equitable distribution of housing for which the community expressed support. Multiple new actions were introduced to further facilitate the construction of small and midrise multi-family buildings that can serve middle-income households as this was a building type broadly supported by the public for new development, especially as a means to increase density on the west and north sides of the city (Policy 26). Actions range from new construction loan programs to technical assistance to streamlining measures. While staff recognized the not all groups were supportive of streamlining, the policies endeavor to meet community concerns about disempowering local residents in decision-making by tying the incentive to community benefits and criteria that will be created with local communities as well as requirements for anti-displacement investments.

5. INCREASE WEALTH BUILDING OPPORTUNITIES

Not only is wealth building now elevated to an objective within the 2022 Update, but the supporting policies also call for improved access to well-paid jobs and business ownership for American Indian, Black, and other communities of color based. The development of new policies on job and entrepreneurship opportunities were based on the input we heard about the importance of wealth building for housing stability, especially across generations (Policy 16). This is supported by new actions, including “Prioritize capacity-building, job training, start-up, and business development resources for Black-owned developers and construction companies towards building housing” (Policy 16, Action e).

6. BUILD THE KIND OF HOUSING THAT VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES WANT IN THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS

Generally, the draft increases requirements for community involvement in the review of zoning and development proposals. It also calls for zoning
changes within Priority Equity Geographies to serve the specific needs of American Indian, Black, and other communities of color (Policy 18). In response to a call for new building types that facilitate intergenerational and social support systems, policies that support co-housing were updated and expanded to support ways for households to share space, resources, and responsibilities and to reinforce supportive relationships within and across communities and generations (Policy 29).

7. CREATE ACCOUNTABILITY AND SHARE DECISION-MAKING

The revised draft responds to the calls for more transparency and accountability with a new policy initiating a truth-telling process about the impacts of discriminatory government actions to the American Indian, Black and other communities of color that affect their housing access (Policy 10). The draft also includes several new actions aimed at increasing accountability tools that measure progress towards more equitable housing access (Policy 14), such as regularly reporting on housing program metrics to the community, creating a housing policy implementation committee, creating a city budget equity analysis tool for housing investments, improving data collection, and creating a racial and social equity impact framework for regulatory review (Policy 21). Furthermore, to increase community empowerment and better respond to the needs of communities of color, policies and actions were changed to elevate to role of community input in policy, zoning and development review (Policy 13, Action d; Policy 18; Policy 36, Action d).

8. STUDY THE EQUITY IMPACTS OF MARKET-RATE HOUSING

Lastly, the revised draft takes a clearer position on the need to study and end displacement and calls for the City to “prevent the potential displacement and adverse racial and social equity impacts of zoning changes, planning processes, or public and private investments especially in areas vulnerable to displacement” (Policy 21). This is supported by new actions that aim to invest funding in anti-displacement tools to mitigate or eliminate impacts caused by zoning changes, development projects, or infrastructure improvements.

Learn More About the Policy Changes

For more detailed mapping of how the 2022 Update draft changed and how the changes respond to the community directives listed above, please refer to the Revised Policy and Action Table in Appendix H. This table matches all of the revised policies and actions with those from Draft 1 and notes when policies and actions are new, significantly changed, or essentially unchanged. The table also notes when a policy or action directly correlates with a community directive as described above.
6. Lessons Learned and Next Steps

Lessons Learned

This phase of engagement for the Housing Element 2022 Update is representative of the direction SF Planning would like to take in engaging residents in a more equitable way. There was significantly greater outreach to communities of color and vulnerable groups than in past efforts, and staff worked to create a fair compensation model for both community-based organization partners and participants. The work resulted in several lessons for improvement and recognition of the gaps in outreach. Beginning with the gaps in outreach, the following section lists groups that were identified as underrepresented in the outreach and topics that would benefit from further discussion.

Groups underrepresented in Phase II outreach:
- Public housing residents
- American Indian residents
- Black residents
- Westside input on increased density and housing development
- Unhoused population
- Formerly incarcerated residents
- Small landlords/small developers
- Arabic community
- Community-serving organization employees and essential, low-wage workers
- Organized Labor

Themes for further discussion:
- Housing as a vehicle for reparations to communities harmed by discriminatory government action
- Streamlined process in balance with community empowerment
- Alternative community ownership

The following list briefly summarizes some of the lessons learned from Phase II outreach, which staff will take forward into future engagement.

- Asking participants to discuss their housing experience can be re-traumatizing for those that have suffered or are currently suffering from discriminatory actions, housing insecurity, and unsafe housing.
- City staff must track past city outreach efforts and commitments to the community to inform current efforts and to ensure that previous community input is respected. This understanding will help the community and City staff build momentum and continuity in policy conversations.
- SF Planning’s over-reliance on highly technical language in outreach documents needs to be vetted and “interpreted” early and often throughout the process by community partners.
- The digital participation platform requires more promotion and user training to reach a broader audience. The input structure should be refined to allow for more nuanced input.
Future Outreach and Engagement

SF Planning staff will present the revised Housing Element 2022 Update in late January at Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission hearings. The draft will be published to the website and comments will be collected through March 2022. At the same time, staff will reengage several community partners from the summer to address the gaps in outreach cited above and further refine policies and actions in a third phase of outreach. The engagement will primarily consist of small focus groups and interviews and will conclude in late February to prepare a third and final draft of the 2022 Update for publication in late March. As the project moves towards adoption after March 2022, outreach will shift towards information sharing about the proposed Housing Element Update, the environmental review process, and the further analysis with community leaders of the equity outcomes of this body of work. The project will conclude with the adoption of the Housing Element update in January 2023.

Figure 16. Project Timeline
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Focus Group Theme Summaries

01. Right to Housing

CONVERGING IDEAS
Right to housing means that everyone, regardless of income, race, background, or special circumstances, should have equal access to affordable housing. Housing should be a place that provides privacy, freedom to come in and out, safety, access to affordable services (groceries and public transportation), good quality spaces, and a healthy environment where people can thrive. Housing should offer families and individuals opportunities to be in community and access services that can support them in building better lives. Such services include: career and job training, rehabilitation and mental health services, and access to trauma-informed counsellors and social/case workers.

Non-discrimination policies should be in place for people to access housing, live with dignity and in peace, or harmony. Housing should be near, or be accessible to, work opportunities as the right to housing is interrelated with the ability to afford housing through the right to work.

The right to housing should be considered a human right, or as important as having access to other basic human needs like water or air. Therefore, the City has a role in regulating the accumulation of profits/benefits from housing. For example, rent control should be attached to people, not property, and there should be limits to the number of properties owned by the same proprietor.

The right to housing should include the right to choose, as people have different needs and goals. Integrating these two rights would humanize the housing system. The right to choose should include the right to decline housing.

The right to housing should prioritize communities who have been discriminated against, displaced, or forced to live on the streets by City policies. These communities should receive reparations and be given back the spaces lost. Priority should be given to Black/African American, American Indian, Japanese, and Filipino communities. Other priority communities for housing include: low-income communities, communities of color and other vulnerable groups including children, seniors, and people with disabilities.

DIVERGING IDEAS
While some participants considered that the right to housing should include shelters, transitional places, safe parking locations, and to tents on streets (OMI black community and transitional youth), other participants argued that while these are needed emergency solutions, they should not qualify as housing in San Francisco (transitional youth).

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

LGBTQ+ Youth/ Mental health providers (FG 1)
Right to housing needs to include: right to safe housing (avoid places of further victimization), stability, and spaces where you feel safe, secure, and most of all supported.

Seniors (FG 2)
Housing means that no matter how small their income is, people deserve to be housed in a decent place.

People with disabilities (FG 3)
Everyone has a right to housing regardless of income or ethnicity. Anyone who has been discriminated against, displaced, or forced to live on the streets should get reparations.

Filipino community (FG 4)
Housing is about equity; a right should not result in profits for the few.

American Indian community (FG 5)
Housing for the American Indian Community means strengthening the community, access for safe
spaces, and processes that can be more simplified, welcoming and efficient.

**LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)**
Housing rights mean acknowledging harm to marginalized groups. Housing rights means reparative acts. Moreover, it means community safety and being able to stay in a community.

**Transitional youth (FG 7)**
The right to housing means affordable housing rather than temporary solutions. It means affordable living, been able to own a home, but also to live and pay for other expenses.

**Black community, OMI (FG 11)**
Housing means good housing and [access to] other services to have quality of life and health.

**Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 14)**
Right to housing means affordable housing within a safe environment.

**Moderate to very low-income community in the Sunset neighborhood (FG 15)**
While the Housing Element recognizes the right to housing, it is crucial for all city services to recognize it as such.

**Cantonese-speaking community in the Tenderloin (FG 16)**
New housing policy should support eliminating racism from existing and new programs, and result in equitable access to housing.

**Spanish-speaking, Latino/x, seniors, families & youth, Mission (FG 17 & 18)**
For the Latino community, the right to housing means to be able to apply to housing programs without ‘stigma’ or judgment. Some members of the community may feel uncomfortable or vulnerable when asking for support from the government. For the community access to work to afford housing is critical.

The right to housing means living with dignity and in and peaceful [non-stressful and safe] spaces and circumstances.

---

**02. Priority actions to help unhoused or at-risk families and individuals**

Building permanently supportive housing. Building homeless shelters and navigation centers throughout the city, including off-street Safe Parking sites for vehicle dwellers seeking conventional housing. Identify and prioritize vulnerable groups for placement in temporary shelters and permanent supportive housing.

Expand on-site and mobile case management and services for the most vulnerable.

**CONVERGING IDEAS**
Mental health providers working with LGBTQ+ youth stressed the need to increase the number of case managers and navigation services [on-site and mobile], and integrate supportive and mental health services for the most vulnerable. For example, staff from ECS (ONE System) should provide on-site support at navigation centers.

Participants expressed the importance of assigning case managers that can consistently provide guidance to unhoused or at-risk families and individuals and support them with application requirements. Overall, there is a sense that the systems in place need to be “humanizing”, and that service providers need to be trauma-informed in order to build trust and restore dignity. Finding temporary accommodation is the first step to addressing the many challenges that unhoused or at-risk individuals and families face, but long-term support is needed to help unhoused or at-risk families and individuals move forward in the “housing ladder” as their goals and needs change.

Building more permanent affordable housing, in general, as well as on city-owned land, resonated with participants. Permanent housing is needed for vulnerable groups, the idea that people do not need to be “fixed” before being provided housing resonated, as participants consider that being unhoused contributes to drug addiction and mental health issues.
Improvements to existing programs are needed to make living in San Francisco affordable and prevent more families and individuals from becoming unhoused. Younger participants stressed the importance to create stable, well-paid jobs, accessible to young people to prevent the displacement of at-risk youth.

DIVerging Ideas
Participants from focus groups, including transitional youth, seniors, and people with disabilities, considered that navigation centers and shelters should not be considered housing as they offer a temporary solution that does not meet the community’s understanding of what right to housing should encompass.

Other Ideas
Beyond assigning priority in affordable housing lottery, priority actions should focus on removing stigma and barriers to access existing resources, and exploring alternatives to existing forms of means testing [AMI] that prevent at-risk families and individuals from accessing existing resources. Existing systems stigmatize and re-victimize the families and individuals they are trying to help.

New programs are needed to make better use of existing resources, for example using vacant properties to house people.

Participants in several groups mentioned that increasing representation from different communities within the city agencies providing services and assigning resources will result in more equitable outcomes for the wider community.

Financial resources are needed to support the work of local community-based organizations working with unhoused or at-risk families and individuals.

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY
LGBTQ+ Youth/ Mental health providers (FG 1)
- Priority actions should include increasing the number of case managers and navigation services in the city to provide support on-site. Case-managers need to be well educated, trained, well paid, and supported (overwork and burn-out of staff was mentioned). Good supervision is needed too, and diversity.
- More mobile case management is needed. With mobile case management service providers go out, engage those clients, and escort them to service (medical, mental health, and substance use care).
- Safe Parking sites are needed as crime can also create more difficulties for the unhoused individuals.

Seniors (FG 2)
- Navigation centers and tents are not the solution for unhoused population. People do not need to be fixed before they get housing. It is being unhoused and contributes to drug addiction and mental health issues.

People with disabilities (FG 3)
- It is crucial to improve the lottery system. There should be another way to qualifying people instead of AMI.
- Navigation centers and shelters are not housing and should be removed as these options do not offer case management and resemble concentration centers.
- Address mental health.
- Planning Department lacks enough Black planners and other planners of color: inclusion and equity start at the top.
- Improve other aspects of the community like roads, safety, cleanliness.
- Improve SROs to improve quality of life of residents.
- Expand access to housing for low-income and disabled people.
- Rental assistance and building permanent affordable housing on city-owned land is a good idea.

LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)
- Meth users – especially young gay men – need to be considered a vulnerable group and at-risk population.
- People need permanent housing, not shelters. These are often sites of violence and could re-victimize vulnerable groups.

Transitional youth (FG 7)
- Use vacant housing to house people, especially Black and [American] Indian communities.
alternative is to develop a program where vacant units can be managed by an organisation after a period of time [being vacant], and rent out [at affordable prices].

- The most effective way to help unhoused individuals and families is by providing financial resources, in other words, unhoused population needs money.

**Transitional youth (FG 8)**
- The City should buy old houses to build high-rises for apartments, especially in more gentrified areas where old Victorian houses can be transformed into multiple units for multiple families of mixed income, not only rich individuals.
- Young participants expressed that well paid jobs are essential to be able to afford living in San Francisco.

**Black community, Bayview (FG 9)**
- More financial resources are needed such as grants to support the work of local community-based organisations like Providence Foundation.

**Black community, Fillmore/ WA (FG 10)**
- Incentivizing a proactive participation of landlords to provide support systems (resources) for tenants that have problems paying their rent.
- Counselling and therapy could be useful for unhoused/ at-risk people to get some guidance and move forward.
- The time between starting and finishing the process to access housing is too long and allocation of resources could be biased. Adequate representation within the institutions and particularly the people running the systems for housing applications is needed for equitable results.
- More information (outreach from city agencies) is needed to share the resources and normalize using this aid within the community.

**Spanish-speaking, Latino/x, seniors, families & youth, Mission (FG 17 & 18)**
- Immigrant communities and communities with unresolved immigration status need extra support/ flexibility to apply to housing as there are currently too many barriers to access resources. Families and individuals in this situation are often not able to provide the documents needed to apply for/ access housing, for example, credit history, social security number, ID, or pay stubs (paid in cash).

### 03. Priority actions to prevent displacement

**Increasing financial supports**
- Rental assistance (housing vouchers).
- Targeted down-payment assistance loans.

**Increasing deeply affordable housing opportunities**
- Assigning priority in affordable housing lottery.
- Building new permanently affordable housing on City-owned land.
- Preserving affordable housing (i.e., purchase and rehabilitation of SRO buildings).
- Prioritizing approval of development projects serving extremely low and very low-income families and individuals.
- Pursuing alternative types of ownership (i.e., community ownership, co-housing, limited equity, stewardship, and land trust models).

**Strengthening neighborhood amenities and public infrastructure**
- Increasing funding for community-based organizations providing tenant protection and anti-displacement support.
- Prioritizing investments to improve public transit, environmental quality, open space access and quality, and community amenities.

### CONVERGING IDEAS

The Planning Department should review plans from developers to determine if new development will displace communities. The Planning Department’s [actions and policies] should prioritize tenants and low-income people, not developers.

**Financial supports**

Participants agreed with the need to increase financial supports that can help communities of color and low-income communities build intergenerational wealth through ownership. Programs could include targeted down-payment assistance loans, as well rental assistance (housing vouchers). Communities of color should have access to financial aid.
support programs that give them priority to own and rent in in their communities. Financial supports should prioritize Black, American Indian, and low-income communities.

Participants agreed with the need to “expand and sustain increase in senior operating subsidies” and “increase rental assistance housing (housing vouchers)”. However, Latino communities in the Mission and Excelsior, stressed that priority actions must focus on eliminating discriminatory practices related to this program that re-victimize and limit access of low-income communities and communities of color.

**Increasing deeply affordable housing opportunities**

Building more permanent affordable housing, in general, as well as on city-owned land, resonated with participants. Participants agreed that more government-built public housing is needed to serve seniors, low-income communities, and people with disabilities.

Participants agreed with the need to “assign priority in affordable housing lottery”, “preserve affordable housing and improve the condition of existing SRO’s”, and “prioritize approval of development projects serving extremely low-income and very low-income households”.

Participants agreed more guidance and in language resources are needed to navigate the affordable housing lottery, and that the system needs to be more transparent. Priority should be given to unhoused families and individuals, Black, American Indian, extremely low- and low-income families and individuals, as well as those families and individuals that have been in the waitlist the longest or those with overlapping vulnerabilities.

Participants agreed it is essential to develop basic knowledge about alternative community ownership options, these models could help increase ownership within vulnerable communities and keep vulnerable families and individuals housed. Japanese American, Filipino, Black, and American-Indian and transitional age youth participants expressed interest in exploring other forms of community ownership such as Community Land Trusts. There is a desire to learn more about these models, and the City should explore, help scale, and support alternative community ownership.

**Strengthening neighborhood amenities and public infrastructure**

Increasing funding for community-based organizations but also providing the tenant protection and anti-displacement from the city as well.

**OTHER IDEAS**

**Financial supports**
- Offer loans to help pay-off mortgages for at-risk families and individuals.
- Assistance loans for rental deposit and advance rent.

**Building more permanently affordable housing**
- A lack of affordable housing for larger families has contributed to displacement of the Latino community in San Francisco. New permanently affordable housing should include options for families with children.

**Rental assistance**

Beyond assigning priority in affordable housing lottery, priority actions should focus on removing barriers to access existing resources and exploring alternatives to existing forms of means testing [AMI] that prevent at-risk families and individuals from accessing existing resources.

Participants highlighted special consideration in the affordable housing lottery is needed for groups that are likely to present overlapping vulnerabilities including sex workers, foster children and transitional age youth, seniors and people with disabilities, single parents with children in emergency situations (victims of domestic violence, crime, harassment by landlords, mental health crisis, drug users) and families and individuals with unresolved immigration status.

**Rent and other controls**

San Francisco’s rent control program needs to be updated to ensure profits/benefits from this program are equitably distributed. Participants mentioned the following ideas that the City should explore:
• Attaching rent control to a household’s income, not to property.
• Controlling/ regulating of big ownership to prevent displacement
• Capping the number of market-rate units that are allowed to be built and taking steps to remove profit-incentive from housing.
• Capping rent at 30% of a household’s income

Strengthening neighborhoods and communities
• Safety was mentioned by participants as very important to strengthen neighborhoods and prevent displacement.
• Strengthening cultural anchors and cultural communities was mentioned as a strategy to prevent further displacement. Cultural hubs should become “resource hubs” and include social services that are responsive to the particular needs of the community and provided by members of the community.
• Young participants would like to see youth focused community center(s) where they could learn to navigate housing issues, and find other resources that would prevent their displacement.
• For many participants affordability, job access, income and training and opportunities are closely related to housing (being able to access, afford and stay in housing) and should be addressed in parallel to prevent further displacement.

DIVERGING IDEAS
None

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

Seniors (FG 2)
• The current job market had promoted displacement of seniors as government has focused on tech companies bringing lots of rich people pushing everyone else out of the city.
• Planning should analyze plans from developers to determine if it will displace more people. Planning should be oriented towards tenants and low-income people, not developers. Resources of planning should not come from developers so there is no pressure to approve their plans.

Filipino community (FG 4)
• Assigning priority in the housing lottery, transparency of process. Consider other factors like how long you have been on the waitlist, sex workers, foster children that are not supported by the system [transitional age youth]. Housing lottery should consider community character and culture to avoid further gentrification.
• Develop programs to help people pay off a mortgage or any program that can help them own a house rather than paying rent just to get evicted at the end.
• We need more social workers, cultural workers, cultural events, diversity good food, cultural blending.

American Indian community (FG 5)
• Ownership is important – to be able to inherit to the family
• Investing in cultural centers in the neighborhoods you want to live in so that people can use them as resource hubs. The community needs dedicated social services and people to work with the community.

Transitional youth (FG 7)
• Capping the number of market-rate units that are allowed to be built. We need to completely remove the profit-incentive from housing.
• Displacement is also caused by predatory practices from realtors that targeting families and take advantage of people by buying their homes. Some communities are not well informed about these practices and end up being displaced from San Francisco.
• Some landlords discriminate individuals and families using rental vouchers, this needs to be addressed.
• Rent assistance for deposit could help unhoused people access accommodation.
• Affordable housing should be redefined made accessible because currently unhoused people cannot afford ‘affordable housing’.
• Make it easier for Community Land Trusts (CLTs) and co-ops to operate.

Transitional youth (FG 8)
• Young people with a criminal record are many times displaced from the places they used to live. Second chances are important to keep people out of the streets, so there should be plans to
reincorporate these people to the community by giving them access to housing.

- Create a department for youth that look into issues that keep young people from having fair chance at employment, wealth-building, and housing.

Black community, Bayview (FG 9)
- Participants agree that rent/housing expenses should be capped at 30% of the household income, so households can afford other essential needs like food.
- People should be able to own a house, paying rent is not affordable and does not contribute to intergenerational wealth creation.
- It is crucial to improve the housing system because the system itself traps you in a cycle – without a housing plan it is difficult to get a good job, and without a job it’s not possible to afford housing.
- Displacement can be avoided by given priority and support to black community to own and rent in their neighborhoods, rather than leaving all to the market as it seems other wealthier communities are pushing the black community out by placing their people in traditional black neighborhoods.
- Lack of opportunities like low-income jobs or no jobs have trapped some Black people on drugs.

Black community, Fillmore/ WA (FG 10)
- The community is interested in land trust model which they consider may contribute to stop displacement.
- Financial education
- Secure parking – there is some affordable housing but lots of insecurity can still displace people.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Bayview (FG 12)
- Building more affordable housing would help prevent displacement and homelessness and give people more opportunity for housing. Having community-based organizations addressing displacement and homelessness
- There should be support programs for program applicants to improve their job training and income generally so that they aren’t always reaching out to the government for help.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 13)
- More government-built (public) housing is probably the most important, especially to serve seniors, low-income people, and people with disabilities.
- Improved public amenities and infrastructure to ensure Richmond is barrier-free/accessible to all neighborhoods

Cantonese-speaking community in the Tenderloin (FG 16)
- Prioritize people who have lived for decades in the community rather than people who are new.
- Rent control and legislation- Landlords shouldn’t be allowed to buy out tenants. There needs to be a limit on the price they can rent or sell a unit for after they evict a tenant

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x, seniors, families & youth, Mission & Excelsior (FG 17 & 18, 19)
- The Latino community considers that displacement can be prevented by removing barriers and increasing funding to existing programs to access housing. Many community members hold seasonal jobs that pay in cash, making it difficult to save money for deposit and rent, demonstrate credit history, and collect the paperwork required to access existing housing programs (particularly important for individuals with unresolved immigration status).
- A lack of affordable housing for families (more rooms) has contributed to displacement of the Latino community in SF. Many families live in stressful overcrowded conditions that contribute to abuse from landlords, mental health issues, and domestic violence.
- For the Latino community access to jobs that pay enough to afford housing in San Francisco is critical. Housing costs (rent) should be relative to household income.
- Education and knowledge of tenant rights and existent housing programs is needed in the community.
- Rent assistance has helped during the pandemic but many community members shared stories of discrimination and abuse by landlords who take advantage of a lack of knowledge of tenant rights, language barriers, and unresolved immigration status that leave families and individuals
with no protections. These families are often victims of harassment and are forced to live in overcrowded, unsanitary conditions.

- The city should address safety in all neighborhoods to prevent displacement, but especially in neighborhoods where new housing is planned. Families with teens assigned housing in areas of the City where crime and drugs are an issue (the Tenderloin was provided as an example) prefer to leave San Francisco.

Japanese American community, Japantown (FG 20)

- Increasing funding for community-based organizations but also providing the tenant protection and anti-displacement from the city as well.
- Current programs need to be adjusted to new realities and personal circumstances and goals (more flexible). For example, the school district has a forgivable loan, but the rules do not allow to buy in some places as there is a maximum price and basically the only houses that can be purchased are in Bayview or Hunters Point, no matter where you teach. So, it would make sense to align the program to where you teach.
- It is crucial to develop basic knowledge about alternative ownership type in the community and the consequences that come with changing to market rate, because people can easily lose their homes.

Moderate to very low-income community in the Richmond (FG21)

- Participants agreed more guidance is needed to get into lottery. Also, that it is important to prioritize extremely low- and low-income individuals.

04. Right to return

- Prioritizing and targeting select vulnerable groups for affordable homeownership opportunities programs.
- Dedicating land to American Indian Communities.
- Pursuing alternative types of ownership that put land in community hands (i.e. community ownership, co-housing, limited equity, stewardship, and land trust models).
- Strengthening cultural anchors and connections including investing in the Cultural District program.

CONVERGING IDEAS

Right to return means welcoming displaced communities back to San Francisco providing safe spaces and adequate supporting services to build community and thrive. For most of the groups, right to return means acknowledging the history and discriminatory policies that led to displacement in the first place, recognizing that such policies and practices continue to displace and harm communities today, and actively work to dismantle such policies and practices.

Right to return means having the right to stay and the right to choose where to live in the city. Priority for right to return should be given to communities that have been forcibly displaced, including American Indian, Black American, Japanese American, and Filipino San Franciscan communities, native or with multi-generational connections to the city. The right to return should restore the services that the communities lost and need in order to thrive, such as social services, and cultural amenities.

Japanese American participants agreed that the right to return should honor Certificates of Preference granted to Japanese American Families. The city should investigate further the status of these Certificates and follow up with families. For younger Japanese American participants not directly affected by displacement, right to return means opportunities to stay and live in their community, raise their families in their community, own business and property in their community, welcome new immigrants, and strengthen the cultural bonds and anchors.

For participants from the Filipino community right to return means the right to know your community’s history and the contributions of your community, and to experience a sense of belonging in the city. The right to return should invest and restore other forms of community wealth such as culture.

Participants agreed it is essential to explore and implement alternative community ownership options, these models could help increase ownership of displaced communities. There is a desire to learn more about these models, and the City should provide more information, help scale, and support alternative models of community ownership.
OTHER IDEAS

- Right to return policy should differentiate between Black and Black Americans.
- Right to return should consider formerly incarcerated members of the community who have been displaced multiple times and are not allowed to return to their communities.
- Right to return should consider communities displaced by economic policies that have made the city unaffordable. Participants mentioned displaced young families, Latino families, seniors, and individuals, and members of the LGBTQ+ community that rely on proximity to feel safe and have access to culturally competent services.

DIVERGING IDEAS

None

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

Seniors (FG 2)

- Bringing people back, does not mean to have them all live on 3rd Street, but to let them have a choice where to live, because they were displaced due to discrimination or racism. There should be a pipeline for people who worked here, lived here, had a family here.
- Young families wanted a home, but to afford one they had to leave San Francisco. They should be allowed to come back.

Filipino community (FG 4)

- Right to know [your community’s] history, language, to understand where your community came from and the contributions of those who came before you. People don’t know that the real Manilatown was in Kearny Street. Colonization has [made this even more difficult for Filipinos], we don’t know where we coming from sometimes given our history in our country. Knowing the history will make people feel that they belong to this city.

American Indian community (FG 5)

- American Indians should be prioritized. It is the native community who can choose to take that route or not.
- Right to return means bringing Native Americans back and having the social services that they used to have before. [The community wants] senior housing, housing for families, for disabled, not just in our Cultural District but everywhere that the community wants to live in this city. Having the chance to choose where and that it is affordable is it important to return to the city.

LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)

- Many members of the LGBTQ community could not afford to stay in SF. Therefore, right to return also means a right to stay.
- Moreover, there are people that need to be in the Castro for safety reasons; these people need to stay.

Black community, Bayview (FG 9)

- The right to return means for our community that even incarcerated people can be able to come back and find the support needed to stop the cycle. There should be no restrictions on people coming back and should be given automatically to us.
- However, it is important to highlight that black people have never left; we have always been here.
- Need for prioritization of Black people and Black native San Franciscans for return (born here, generational connections to here) that help you rise above the lottery. It’s important to differentiate in the policy “Black Americans”

Black community, Fillmore/ WA (FG 10)

- Right to return is as somebody opens the door again for the black community to come back to the city. It means to prioritize BIPOC communities for opportunities for housing, especially where there is a lack of resources like in the Western Addition.
- The right to return means for the community that they are ‘welcome back’ to the city and that the government will provide some protection and support.

Japanese American community, Japantown (FG 20)

- Participants in the community considered that Certificate of Preferences is important in terms of the right to come back to this community.
- For people who came after the War and did not have property or land taken away, for these
community members having the right to return means, the return to having a safe space, to continue to grow the Japanese and Japanese American community and for new immigrants from Japan to come here.

- Right to return also means ownership of Japanese in Japan Town, if the ownership stays low the community will lose its neighborhood. Additionally, there is disproportionate senior housing, there is nothing for youth and family to strengthen the community and provide guardianship.
- Building community means people – and people needing those things around it, without people we are becoming only a tourist site.

05. Empowering communities

What kind of community engagement process would be needed to ensure your community is empowered to guide, monitor and implement policies and actions related to housing?

- Targeted engagement and elevated representation of American Indian, Black, and other Communities of Color in decision making bodies such as Community Advisory Councils (CACs).
- Investing in community-led planning efforts:
  - Cultural District strategic planning.
  - Working in partnership with CBOs serving and representing American Indian, Black, other People of Color, and other vulnerable groups.

CONTINUED ENGAGEMENT

What would be the best way to approach community engagement for new housing in your community? What has or hasn’t worked in the past?

[Continued engagement was addressed in most Focus Groups, and feedback included ideas related to empowering communities]

CONVERGING IDEAS

Community engagement formats, incentives, and tools

For focus group participants, it is essential that the city increases efforts to make information more easily available and accessible. Materials should be readily available in different languages, through varied media, and in a timely manner to enable communities to influence decisions.

Participants considered in-person events such as community and townhall meetings a preferred source of information, but venues and times need to be convenient for community members to participate. It was noted, however, that the pandemic has exposed more community members to digital tools and online meeting platforms, enabling broader participation from community members that have restricted time and flexibility due to work and family commitments.

To increase participation both online and digital engagement processes should consider participant incentives such as gift cards and/or other supports such as childcare, as well as timelines that allow for more targeted participant recruitment efforts. Traditional tools such as telephone calls, door-to-door, and one-on-one communication is needed to reach vulnerable groups such as seniors, people with disabilities, and families and individuals that are unhoused or in an unstable housing situation. Barriers need to be lifted to increase participation from vulnerable groups, and transportation to in-person events, internet access, and in-language tools must be provided. Many participants including seniors, prefer reviewing hard copies of written materials. Cantonese and Spanish-speaking communities require in-language materials and facilitation, and noted that radio and local newspapers are important sources of information in their communities. Most importantly, participants expressed the need for concise, clear information with minimal use of technical jargon.

In general, participants were cautious about the role of social media for community engagement processes. In their experience, social media does not facilitate constructive dialogue or support community cohesion. Nevertheless, younger participants expressed the need to invest in better online participation and informational tools.

There was wide-spread support for place-based resource hubs where community members can access information, social services, and resources (including housing-related resources and support).
delivered in their language and by members from their community. Young participants were particularly interested in a model that is youth-focused and can provide resources and training in essential topics not taught at school such as wealth creation, taxes, and housing.

Many participants emphasized the role of community engagement events in re-introducing the experience of a “sense of community that breeds joy and happiness, which our communities have been stripped of”.

**Community-led planning efforts**
Some participants (Black community, Bayview) expressed support for community committees or councils to advise on housing related issues. Participants expressed that government should support and fund the development of leadership from within communities to build trust between public agencies and the communities they serve.

Participants were very supportive of partnerships that involve trusted community-based organizations to disseminate information, reach the most vulnerable community groups, and connect families and individuals in need with housing organizations and resources. Participants mentioned opportunities to partner with service providers (clinics, medical and psychiatric care), schools, senior centers, and local non-profits.

**Capacity building, representation, and leadership**
Effective community engagement must be supported by capacity building (training and education on housing-related issues), to enable community members to be fully informed and guide processes. Capacity building should take place on a regular basis, not only when outreach is required for a plan update. Participants mentioned the following areas where capacity building is needed: tenant and housing rights and responsibilities, real estate and homeownership, financial literacy and wealth creation, equity and cultural competency, income creation and job opportunities, policy and legislation, public speaking, leadership, existing housing programs, and other city resources.

Representation of diverse communities is needed in all outreach efforts, within the Planning Department and other public agencies that allocate resources, write policy, and make decisions related to housing. Diverse representation will help the Planning Department develop deeper connections and build trust with communities.

Participants mentioned the importance of city agency leaders and Supervisors attending community engagement events (FG 9 and 22). Participants acknowledge that the process of developing diverse leadership and representation within city agencies will take time and investment, but when decision makers attend community meetings they build their own capacity to advocate for, commit to, and make better (more equitable) decisions on behalf of the communities they serve.

**Empowering communities/ powerlessness**
In general, participants did not address empowerment, but rather the sense of powerlessness that they have experienced when attempting to access city programs and resources (such as the affordable housing lottery). Existing housing programs and systems contribute to this sense of powerlessness by de-humanizing already vulnerable community members, and by operating without transparency, and accountability. These systems are re-victimizing vulnerable groups, perpetuating inequities and harms from discrimination, and alienating communities.

**Continued engagement specific to housing projects**
Participants expressed that one focus group was not sufficient to address critical issues such as housing. They recommend continued engagement for housing projects is needed. Engagement should start early and involve small businesses, communities that will receive new housing, existing residents, and extremely-low income communities.

Participants expect more accountability and transparency of community engagement processes led by city agencies. Following an engagement event, city agencies should report back, explaining how community feedback was incorporated and how they plan to move forward with diverging perspectives. For the Housing Element process, participants expressed interest in taking part in a final event at the end of the process to know the outcomes.
OTHER IDEAS
Participants’ diverse cultural background brought a broad range of perspectives and approaches to San Francisco’s housing challenges. San Francisco could learn from other cultures to find better ways to strengthen communities and solve similar housing problems. Examples from China, Singapore, and the Philippines were mentioned in focus groups.

Participants from the Japanese American community (FG 20) perceive seniors in the community as more resistant to change and recommend more, early engagement of seniors and intergenerational dialogue to enable communities to move forward together.

DIVERGING IDEAS
While partnerships with community-based organizations were considered a positive approach to more authentic and representative community engagement processes, participants from the Latino community (FG 17 & 18) expressed a desire to work with and hear directly from Planning Department staff to build trust.

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY
LGBTQ+ Youth/ Mental health providers (FG 1)
• Relationship with the community needs to be nurtured and people moving into [new housing] need to be understood.
• Expand focus groups in the community maybe with city clinics that are full-service partnership clinics with medical care, psychiatric care, case management, as they work with unhoused communities. Hearing from the folks that are dealing with the actual struggle makes a lot of sense.

Seniors (FG 2)
• We need more opportunities for public outreach. The focus group was too short for such big matters.

People with disabilities (FG 3)
• The community needs to connect with the different housing organizations that are trying to provide housing for low-income people and get their input before moving forward.

• The outreach activities need to be representative of the Black community. This can develop connection and trust.

Filipino community (FG 4)
• People in America need to learn from other cultures how to look after each other and how other cultures solve similar problems.

American Indian community (FG 5)
• Series of community meetings to the meaning of housing. It is still important to reach folks by telephone as it is a more conventional way of communication. One on one communication is needed especially with the elders in the community. However, there should be a place people can visit to get information in case they do not have emails or phone.
• The community considers the government needs to make an effort in providing equity in the opportunities given to the communities living in San Francisco to eliminate favoritisms.
• The community perceives that extra help to understand housing-related policy and information would be beneficial. Provide access to the information on a timely manner to be able to influence decisions.

Transitional youth (FG 7)
• The sense of community also breeds joy and happiness which our communities have been stripped of.
• Creating a place where people can go to help people, especially those that grew up in San Francisco.
• Create better online platforms because young people are tech savvy and with everyone being busy having something online to check information would be convenient.

Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)
• Develop a list of resources and send them to schools to be shared with the families and students.
• Create a place with all the options [services], in different neighborhoods and have different hubs that can support the community.
• Communicate the information through advertisement to reach young people – in transportation- through website and links (generation is technology driven).
Black community, Bayview (FG 9)
• Representation is important the community wants to be reflected in all the work developed by Planning.
• However, the community also considered that white people can advocate for the community as they have the most powerful seats and the financial resources.
• Creating a committee to represent the community around housing issues.
• Training people inside the community to write policy; who can public speak; we need mentors for our youth and grants for school. Educated black people need to do some outreach to educate communities.
• The community agreed there is a need for more participation with the Planning Department. They want to work with the government (to be hired) to develop the programs and be involved in the decisions.

Black community, Fillmore/WA (FG 10)
• Schools can help spread awareness about this new housing development because people are still unaware that their input is important. To help parents get informed, parents have a busy schedule. (Many participants agree with this point)
• There are some non-profits and agencies in the Fillmore and other places like Black Infant Health that could provide the information, Planning can reach out to them to spread awareness.

Black community, OMI (FG 11)
• Town hall meetings allow residents to connect with each other. Also going door to door to share information.
• Education about tenant and resident responsibility needs to be taught. Also, education about real estate, rental, homeownership, equity, and income in this community.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Bayview (FG 12)
• Community engagement should start before new housing, to give people an opportunity to give ideas on where it should be located and what it looks like. And to notify people in the community about the opportunity to apply to the housing first.
• Housing developers should respond to the community’ needs, and follow requirements.
• Translators are needed. Materials and websites should be available in Chinese.
• Chinese people often do no participate in community events and meetings because they do not know about them.
• The Chinese community found useful NextDoor app or WeChat, rather than fliers.
• Incentives through gift cards can make people more interested in participating.
• Ongoing accountability.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Richmond (FG 13)
• The role of community-based organizations is important to develop outreach and communication. More ads in the newspaper, posters, and on the Chinese-speaking radio.
• Focus groups and community meetings need to recruit more participants and be more diverse.

Moderate to very low-income community in the Sunset neighborhood (FG 15)
• Give feedback online, however social media needs to be used carefully.
• Reaching out directly to stakeholders, like Irish Cultural Center, and asking small businesses that are already in the neighborhood.
• Involve groups that plan to occupy new housing.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x seniors (FG 17)
• For the Latino community written information in the form of bulletins and fliers. Also, other conventional forms of communication like television and radio. Online information through social media could also be useful.
• We would like to see a Latino center or an office that represents us in the Planning Department to trust the people working there. The community would appreciate fewer intermediaries because many times we are the last to hear about opportunities.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families & youth (FG 18)
• It is important to develop an inclusive policy regarding housing, therefore it should be open to people from different cultures and languages.
• Information about housing needs to be shared.
and disseminated throughout the community through workshops, creating a group of promoters; fliers and advertisement at the busses or Bart stops; online; and direct contact. But more importantly it must be in Spanish and English. The is a need for representation of the Latino community, to work directly with the people, so the community opens up.

**Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families, Excelsior (FG 19)**
- Online meetings make it more accessible to Latino families. Sometimes families have difficulties participating in events due to language, childcare, transportation, etc.
- Informative workshops about rights, and law for families given at community centers or in schools.
- The community will like to participate in a final event at the end of the project to know the outcomes.

**Japanese American community, Japantown (FG 20)**
- We often get the push back from seniors in the community regarding new housing because it will create a lot of change, but to move forward the support of the seniors is very important.

**Moderate to very low-income community in the Richmond (FG 21)**
- Make information available in multiple languages to reach those that have difficulty understanding English. The information needs to be clear and concise.
- Choose venues and times that are most convenient for people to participate and understand. Also, activities in a relaxed mood to get people’s attention.
- Have project ambassadors at senior centers.

**Moderate to very low-income community, Western (FG 22)**
- Community meetings for neighborhoods that they want to build in is important. Actually listen and not just to check the box.
- More participation from Supervisors.

---

**06. Type of public infrastructure needed**

What type of amenities and public infrastructure investments should be prioritized to prepare neighborhoods to receive more housing?

**CONVERGING IDEAS**

Participants agreed that expanding and increasing the reliability of public transit is a priority. Access to, and investment in the quality of green areas, parks, playgrounds, should also be prioritized. Participants identified opportunities to make better use of existing resources including the multi-purpose use of streets and sidewalks to integrate bike lanes, parklets and other amenities.

Some participants pointed out the need to maximizing the use of existing vacant properties, proposing that the city could buy vacant properties to increase affordable housing opportunities.

Community infrastructure and services need to be strengthened and access expanded. New housing should include onsite community infrastructure or be located in proximity to hubs where services can be accessed walking, cycling, or using public transit. Community infrastructure and services mentioned by participants include:

- Social services, health services, nursing, clinics, elder care services
- Postal service
- Multi-lingual services (should not only be concentrated in Chinatown for Cantonese-speakers or in the Mission for Spanish-speakers)
- Cultural activities
- Shared community amenities (laundry, internet, computers, TV)
- Grocery stores, restaurants (affordable and culturally relevant choices are needed)

To prepare the western neighborhoods to receive housing, participants agreed that strengthening and expanding access to community services is important, as well as developing distinct strategies that focus on the unique qualities of these neighborhoods to generate economic development opportunities (FG 15). These opportunities could include improved or
new tourist attractions (for example Ocean Beach, Golden Gate Park, Sutro Baths swimming pools), business opportunities and job creation (FG15). Participants mentioned that this strategy would require a less centralized approach to public transit by creating job opportunities and shopping opportunities in the western neighborhoods.

Some participants (FG 14) mentioned the importance of investing in culturally competent spaces and programs that can support “harmony and cooperation” across different cultural groups. Similarly, others (FG 6) expressed the need to invest in public programs that promote “peaceful and respectful co-existence” and reduce emotional and physical violence caused by differences in class, race, sexual orientation and other cultural tensions.

Safety is a concern shared in several focus groups, and the city should improve safety and create safe spaces in the city.

**DIVERGING IDEAS**

Although participants agreed that access and reliability of public transit needs to be improved, several participants are concerned about parking and increased competition for on street parking that would result from new housing development.

**PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY**

**LGBTQ+ Youth/ Mental health providers (FG 1)**
- Services will need to be included in the building itself or close by and easily accessible by public transit.
- Transit needs to be reliable, invest in Muni

**Seniors (FG 2)**
- The government should invest in more public transport.

**People with disabilities (FG 3)**
- Invest in skilled nursing facilities and residential board and care

**LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)**
- Investing public funding in programs that promote peaceful and respectful co-existence between people who pay market rate housing and low-income individuals. This would avoid emotional and physical violence caused by class, race, sexual orientation and other cultural tensions.

**Transitional youth (FG 7)**
- Improve transit services

**Black community, OMI (FG 11)**
- Invest in the development of housing organizations, hospital, medical clinic, postal service.

**Cantonese-speaking community in the Bayview (FG 12)**
- The city should provide social workers per residents to address their daily problems, providing elder care services, social services, multilingual services, and so on.
- Cultural activities and parks
- Chinese-language outreach and services are concentrated in Chinatown, which makes it difficult for Chinese living outside of Chinatown to get services.

**Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset neighborhood (FG 14)**
- Invest in the development of comfortable and safe spaces (security cameras)
- Promoting cultural harmony and cooperation
- Community spaces: in-unit laundry, wi-fi, public computers, and TVs

**Moderate to very low-income community in the Sunset neighborhood (FG 15)**
- Tourist attractions are very important, like reinforcing the seawalls along Ocean Beach or refurbishing the old swimming pools.
- Street space can be converted into wider sidewalks, parklets, bike paths or even in diagonal parking. Invest in spaces we already have and use them as multi-purposed resources.

**Cantonese-speaking community in the Tenderloin (FG 16)**
- The neighborhood should be convenient – with grocery stores, places to eat, and open green space.

**Spanish-speaking, Latino/x seniors (FG 17)**
- The new buildings should provide parking for residents
Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families, Excelsior (FG 19)
• Parks

Moderate to very low-income community, Western (FG 22)
• Maximizing on existing vacant properties, the city could buy these properties to have more housing opportunities.
• Investing in preserving the communities it’s really important especially during development.

07. Investment of Public Funding

How should the City invest public funding to support moderate and middle-income families and individuals?

CONVERGING IDEAS
Moderate- and middle-income families and individuals would benefit from investment of public funding in programs such as down payment assistance, scholarships, loans and other types of grants. General affordability of living in San Francisco needs to be addressed to help moderate- and middle-income families and individuals; these households are not only burdened by the cost of housing, but there are other critical costs that the city could supplement such as subsidized child care. These type of support programs could prioritize existing neighborhood residents as well as those that work (or volunteer) in local businesses, schools and community organizations.

The use of public funds for housing should prioritize ownership, which could also help stabilize communities.

Some participants pointed out the need to maximizing the use of existing vacant or underutilized properties, proposing that the city could buy these properties to build new housing and create opportunities transitional uses that bring economic development opportunities (FG 20), La Cocina was mentioned as an example. The city should not lose these opportunities to “big ownership”.

Other ideas to invest public funding to support moderate- and middle-income families and individuals include: creation of spaces for artists and cultural workers, developing mentorship programs, reviewing income ranges to qualify for scholarships and grants (increasing access).

DIVERGING IDEAS
Although some participants agree that public funds for housing should prioritize ownership through existing programs such as Down Payment Assistance loan, others expressed concern that these programs are not long-term solutions, as they do not address affordability issues in general, are costly to taxpayers, and add to the cost burden of households.

PROLIMIENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)
• Funding can be invested in creating spaces for musicians, artists and performers of the LGBTQ community.
• Develop mentorship programs.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Richmond (FG 13)
• Down payment assistance was raised as a program in which the city can invest.
• However, other participants consider that the government should not ask people to pay back the down payment assistance loan as the grant recipients already need to pay the monthly mortgage, property taxes, inevitable daily expenses, and insurance, which makes it almost impossible for them to also set aside some money to pay back the grant.
• Rental and down payment assistance are not long-term solutions to and will cost taxpayers a lot of money.
• The government should purchase old low-rise buildings and build taller buildings on those lands.

Japanese American community, Japantown (FG 20)
• Buy buildings and do what they are doing with La Cocina building. Pressing topic for the near future to not lose these buildings to big companies.

Moderate to very low-income community in the Richmond (FG 21)
• Lower the cost of living for other household expenses, like offering programs through the
Richmond Neighborhood Center, Beacon, DCYF summer camp, Rec and Park programs, and increasing the income range to qualify for scholarships. It is important to consider that people are not paying only for housing, there are other costs of living and the city can supplement these other costs of living like subsidized child care, this is a giant part of household expenses.

**Moderate to very low-income community, Western (FG 22)**
- Down Payment Assistance Program
- Help people purchase rather than just with rent, which could help make communities more stable.

**08. Streamlined process**

Do you think a streamlined project approval process is a helpful approach to ensure privately built housing serves moderate and middle-income households?

[this question was only directly addressed in two focus groups (FG 13 & 22). Related inputs from other conversations are included below. There was not sufficient discussion on this sub-topic to create clear points of convergence/divergence]

**American Indian community (FG 5)**
- A streamlined process for affordable housing and units that support multigenerational households.

**LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)**
- At this point, we need to undercut any neighborhood vote [that is against the goal of creating more affordable housing].

**Cantonese-speaking community in the Richmond (FG 13)**
- When asked by a streamlined project approval process the participants of this community focused on their particular concerns like the economic difficulties they will have when retiring as they won’t have enough income to afford other expenses like taxes or insurance.

**Moderate to very low-income community in the Richmond (FG 21)**
- Participants considered important to develop streamlined process for affordable housing.

This way people will benefit from it in the city or our neighborhood. However, they agreed that information should be public and available.

**Moderate to very low-income community, Western (FG 22)**
- Participants, consider that members of the community will not give up the right to examine what’s next to them—it’s a lot to ask of citizens and of people who have paid for years of mortgages to tell them they have no more input.
- A streamlined process can affect communication with the community and transparency on the process.
- Keep community engagement for larger projects. But maybe streamline process for smaller projects.
- About the applications processes, participants considered it was important to be efficient, but that the processes for housing need to be transparent, easy to understand and user friendly.

**09. Types of Housing**

What type of new housing would you like to see built in your community?

**CONVERGING IDEAS**

Participants would like to see affordable housing built in their communities. This means housing that is affordable to them as well as extremely low and very low-income households. Interior spaces should be generous and offer the basic accommodations so residents can live with dignity. Basic accommodations mentioned include a private bathroom, a kitchen, elevators, a bathtub, and ample circulation space for wheelchairs and walking aids. The facilities should be clean and safe. New housing should be welcoming and include amenities that will help community members thrive such as green open spaces or community gardens, community rooms and connections to cultural programming. Participants would like to see new housing in their communities that is and looks permanent (not transitional).

Participants mentioned variety in housing types is needed:
• Housing designed for seniors, people with disabilities, formerly incarcerated individuals and other vulnerable groups (drug users, unhoused) offering on-site health and social services support and meals.
• Multigenerational housing and housing for families with kid friendly spaces. Participants shared experiences of landlords discriminating against families with children, and the stress of having neighbors complain.
• Duplexes, fourplexes, townhouses, infill housing, multi-bedroom, and housing above existing commercial corridors.
• Free housing for unhoused residents that offers services and meals.
• Renovated houses and SROs to improve quality of life of low-income residents.
• Housing for moderate and middle-income seniors that are looking to downsize, which could in turn free up houses for families.

DIVERGING IDEAS

Participants would not like to see small units of the quality of existing SRO’s, however, there was interest in tiny homes and compact housing.

Participants agree that more housing in San Francisco means more density, but what is considered an acceptable new housing building height varies:
• 3 to 6 stories to avoid blocking views (Western neighborhoods FG 15 and 22).
• Small buildings allow a better quality of life and co-existence with neighbors. Multigenerational households need space to raise children, as a minimum require 2 to 3 rooms with two bathrooms (FG 17, 18, 8).
• Buildings of 10 to 12 stories (FG 13)
• Duplexes, fourplexes, 3-4 stories (Western neighborhoods)

Some participants mentioned mixed-income housing as a housing type to be included, but many more highlighted that mixed income housing creates tensions between residents due to cultural and class differences. While participants would like to live in mixed income communities, in their experience mixed income housing is not perceived as contributing to a high quality of life of residents.

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

LGBTQ+ Youth/ Mental health providers (FG 1)
• Studio apartments or one-bedroom apartments things that any of us will want.
• Clean and spacious place with their own private bathroom.
• New construction should make sure there is green/outdoor space

Seniors (FG 2)
• Seniors should also have a bathtub – a full facility where they can bathe. We need space for wheelchairs and walkers. Bathrooms with hand rails. Easy access to the room, no more climbing stairs, but elevators. Things convenient to reach. Help buttons.
• SRO with services. There were many units with meals provided in common spaces or supportive housing.

People with disabilities (FG 3)
• Transitional housing, from SROs to one- and two-bedroom apartment units
• Special buildings that serve to support reintegra- tion of formerly incarcerated individuals.

Filipino community (FG 4)
• Multi-level condos and apartments but also bigger units for single families.
• Housing should be a 100% affordable below market rate
• Mixed income, people of different income levels living together is a great way of build community.

American Indian community (FG 5)
• Multigenerational households not something that looks transitional
• A building with a gym and free parking, community room, right next to the Cultural Centre.

LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)
• We need more dense, tall housing.
• We need bigger, not small individual housing

Transitional youth (FG 7)
• Multi-generational housing.
• Architecture should reflect the culture of SF, no more sterile looking glass housing.
• We need bigger spaces because a lot of these apartments I feel like all of these units are 2-bed a 1-bath.
• Mixed buildings where there is affordable and above market rate value there is the need to develop a culture of community to decrease tension between tenants.

Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)
• No more new housing development that stack upon each other like jails. You are packing families into high rise, and they have no space to raise families.
• Townhouses and condominiums with space to flourish, with clubs and things kids could be attracted to. Buildings should be more welcoming, influenced by the community and gardens.
• Oakland builds tiny homes for people to have somewhere to go/live while they transition to get their own apartment.
• Reclaim more land from the Bay or tear down old buildings, make small experiments with housing. Tear down military barracks, build new.

Black community, Bayview (FG 9)
• Participants want a front yard; want kid and family friendly buildings
• Townhouses
• New houses are too small this is not good for mental health.
• Diversity in housing in a community would be better, for example having senior housing, affordable housing, and housing for young people together.

Black community, Fillmore/WA (FG 10)
• Multi-bedroom housing is needed instead of studios.
• 2,3,4-bedroom homes that are affordable

Black community, OMI (FG 11)
• Affordable

Cantonese-speaking community in the Bayview (FG 12)
• New housing that isn’t so high or more convenient to access. Either shorter buildings or taller buildings with elevators.
• Smaller units to allow for homeownership opportunities like condos.
• New housing should be mixed income. A community with only very low-income people could have a lot of problems.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Richmond (FG 13)
• Build 10- or 12-story affordable housing

Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 14)
• Diversity of unit sizes
• For existing two-story buildings, it would solve a lot of problems to be able to build out another floor.
• Good quality buildings and family friendly buildings
• More senior housing options with dining and activity facilities

Moderate to very low-income community in the Sunset neighborhood (FG 15)
• Participants agreed that building 3 to 4 stories is the way to go to avoid blocking views.
• Smaller units – not like terrible condition SROs
• New developments should incorporate recreational green areas

Cantonese-speaking community in the Tenderloin (FG 16)
• Build compact housing; free housing and free meal for homeless
• Renovate old units and build small kitchen
• If you can’t build out, build up!
• Affordable housing shouldn’t be segregated. it shouldn’t be, “this one is for rich people, and this one is for poor people.” Even people with higher incomes treat rent as big burden. People who is right in the middle – have less access to support and rent is still a burden.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x seniors (FG 17)
• Spacious housing, thinking of families
• Intergenerational housing
• Affordable housing with good bathrooms for disabled people

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families & youth (FG 18)
• Big enough to house for small families
• People don’t want to feel they are been piled up

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families, Excelsior (FG 19)
• Affordable - Multiple housing for large families, 6 people
• Apartments that have 2 to 3 rooms with two bathrooms

Moderate to very low-income community in the Richmond (FG 21)
• The city can build in a lot of land tiny homes, 4 little homes or 6 little homes on one property for mostly house single-income people
• Duplexes, fourplexes, 2-bedroom condos

Moderate to very low-income community, Western (FG 22)
• Senior housing is needed with different options.
• Some wealthy seniors are bound in their homes that may be too large for them. They could release these houses for families that could use the space
• Infill housing, like Taraval, Judah, Noriega, parts of Irving, Ocean Ave, West Portal, you see one story shops with nothing on top—give some sort of incentive to owner to expand.
• Not huge complex that will block everyone else’s home.

10. Who should new housing be for

CONVERGING IDEAS
When asked about who should new housing be for participants agreed that new housing should be for everyone, but vulnerable groups should be prioritized.

Priority communities mentioned include: unhoused families and individuals, Black Americans, American Indians, families (including single parents), individuals previously displaced by discriminatory policies (i.e., Certificate of Preference holders and their descendants), seniors (including moderate-income seniors looking to downsize), teachers, transitional age youth, recent college graduates, families, extremely low, very low- and moderate-income individuals, formerly incarcerated individuals, caregivers and people with disabilities. Preference for housing opportunities should be given to those born and raised in the neighborhood or in San Francisco, existing residents, and those who have been in affordable housing wait lists for longer. Artists, community-based organization and small business workforce should also be prioritized for housing.

DIVERGING IDEAS
Participants felt that they will not be welcomed in new housing proposed to be built in opportunity areas, as there is a perception that the houses will be for the people who work in technology and tourists and that “affordable housing” will remain unaffordable to them.

While participants acknowledged that market rate housing also needs to be built for higher income groups, conversations were focused on affordable housing and prioritization of the most vulnerable groups. Participants acknowledged that such policy should be implemented carefully to avoid unintended displacement and discrimination. While some participants strongly support prioritization by race (Black community, American Indian community), other participants perceive prioritization by needs and income as the fairest approach.

PROLIFIC IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY
Seniors (FG 2)
• Priority should be seniors living in a big house by themselves that might not be suited for that space anymore but living there because they don’t have any good alternatives, so that maybe that house can go to a family.

People with disabilities (FG 3)
• Black Americans

Filipino community (FG 4)
• Prioritize housing for families, single parents, and people with kids, people that are at-risk of being displaced.

LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)
• Aging LGBTQ residents
• People in transition
• We need queer density. It’s good to concentrate us.

Transitional youth (FG 7)
• Prioritize young, LGBTQ youth, families
• Unhoused class
• The working class
• Prioritization of the born and raised in San Francisco
Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)
- Families should be prioritized and young people with kids.
- Housing opportunity shouldn’t be equal for everybody. Black and [American] Indians should be living in the city, we should get some sort of fair advantage.

Black community, Fillmore/WA (FG 10)
- Participants felt that they will not be welcomed in the houses that are being built in opportunity areas, as there is a impression that the houses will be for the people who work in technology and tourists. They feel that the new buildings will accommodate the money they want in this area.

Black community, OMI (FG 11)
- Black people and members of the community who was here first.
- Prioritize seniors and transitional aged youth first.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 14)
- The government shouldn’t focus just on low-income people, but also middle-income people.
- Chinese-serving senior housing.
- People who have lived here for years, and worked and paid taxes.
- Priority for people who haven’t lived in affordable housing before. And then a second priority for families that may already have housing, but need a larger place for their growing family
- Consideration for those who applied for housing first.

Moderate to very low-income community in the Sunset neighborhood (FG 15)
- Low-income folks already in the Sunset.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Tenderloin (FG 16)
- The focus should be in people’s financial circumstances and not think about it in terms of race. Consider people’s needs and income instead, that would be fair.
- Disabled
- People who have contributed to society.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x seniors, families & youth (FG 17, 18)
- Families and seniors
- Latino working class community
- Those who don’t have money, or can only pay the minimum

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families, Excelsior (FG 19)
- Give priority to those who already live there, but being careful of not causing more discrimination.

Japanese American community, Japantown (FG 20)
- Prioritizing community-based organizations, non-profits, educators, artists, small businesses.
- Workforce housing and people with Certificate of Preference and their descendants.
- This housing should also serve people who are already living in the community not necessarily Japanese American or involved in the community.

Moderate to very low-income community in the Richmond (FG 21)
- Families and seniors.
- Teachers, someone just out of college.
- Don’t lose focus on those who are middle income and don’t qualify for any support.
- Caregivers of seniors as well as child caregivers.

Moderate to very low-income community, Western (FG 22)
- Not necessarily low-income senior housing, just regular not very wealthy seniors
- Diversity, affordable housing, people who want to live here can live here
- For students especially for City College
- Young professionals who want to start a family.

11. Location of new housing

CONVERGING IDEAS

In general, participants agreed that the distribution of housing across the city needs to be corrected, and that there is a need to relax regulations for new housing to be built in the west of the city. New housing needs to be built where there is access community amenities, services, public transit, and in parts of the city that are perceived as safe.
The location of the new housing should be in low-density neighborhoods, the westside of the city and mainly along transit lines and commercial corridors. Some of the neighborhoods mentioned by the participants are Sunset, Richmond, Ocean Ave., Taraval Ave, Golden Gate Park, Ingleside, Lakeview, and Presidio area. Other central locations such as Noe Valle, Cole Valley, Nob Hill, Potrero Hill, and the Marina were also mentioned.

**DIVERGING IDEAS**

Although participants agree that new housing is needed, the Planning Department should also identify underutilized parcels and buildings that the city can buy and transform to housing, and ensure existing housing units do not remain vacant in the city. The Planning Department should investigate how other cities have coped with similar challenges.

Participants agree that more housing opportunities need to be created in the western neighborhoods, however, most participants would prefer to stay in their neighborhoods, close to their community where they can find culturally relevant services and amenities (medical services, education services, childcare services and healthy food). This proximity is particularly important for LGBTQ+ community members and groups that require in-language services (Spanish and Cantonese-speaking participants). Participants would like to see more affordable housing built in their own neighborhoods: Castro, Bayview, Mission, Excelsior, Portola, and in proximity to the former Manilatown and the American Indian Cultural District. Spanish-speaking families and seniors are concerned that western neighborhood communities (perceived as wealthier and majority Caucasian) would not welcome them even if they could afford housing in these areas. However, they would like their children to have the opportunity to own a home in the western neighborhoods and the feel that because their children were born and raised in San Francisco, they have greater opportunity to thrive in different parts of the city.

As well as new affordable housing in their own communities, participants would like to see a commitment to address the unequal distribution of environmental justice burdens that their communities experience and that results in disparate outcomes and lower quality of life for communities of color.

Some of the participants mentioned places where affordable housing should not be built like 25th or 26th Ave, Richmond, and Taraval to avoid blocking views, the Mission (already too crowded) or the Tenderloin (not safe). Although some homeowners in the Richmond expressed concern that new housing could cast a shadow on to other properties, most participants agreed that there are ways to mitigate such impacts through careful planning and early engagement of both the communities the housing is for and their future neighbors.

Participants are concerned that new affordable housing will be stopped by neighbors (“not in my back yard”). Participants from the western neighborhoods are unsure whether this is a large group representative of the western neighborhoods or is just a well-organized, vocal group.

**PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY**

**LGBTQ+ Youth/ Mental health providers (FG 1)**
- High income neighborhoods
- Location is important – Challenge of creating supportive housing in historical affluent neighborhoods.

**Seniors (FG 2)**
- The planning department does know where the land is and where there’s room.
- Inner Sunset, Lakeview, and Sunnyvale.
- People want to stay closer in town where their resources are.
- The Presidio area (even though it is federal owned) and Outer Sunset.

**People with disabilities (FG 3)**
- There needs to be some relaxation on the West side to build more multifamily units.

**Filipino community (FG 4)**
- I would like to see new housing everywhere that’s not been built, outside the downtown area, in the Sunset, in the Richmond district, the West side of San Francisco
- Transit corridors
American Indian community (FG 5)
- Good areas where we can live to feel safe and it should be more quality for all of us in our native communities.
- Cultural District would be my ultimate dream.
- Potrero Hill
- Reducing crime in the neighborhoods some people want to stay or live.
- Golden Gate Park, Silver Ave. and San Bruno [Portola neighborhood by McLaren Park]
- By the ocean, the Marina, lower Nob Hill
- Noe Valley, Cole Valley

LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)
- Castro
- Transit corridors
- Old industrial buildings that may be converted into housing
- Community proximity.

Transitional youth (FG 7)
- Also [proximity to] community services like medical services, education services, childcare services and healthy food.
- Ocean, Sunset, Richmond, and other neighborhoods where people of color could take their space back even like Filipino Town.
- Moving these populations to other districts is kind of avoiding the issues in their own districts. For example, there is affordable housing in the Bayview, and we are just going to make some more somewhere else that doesn’t eliminate the fact that the Bayview has a bunch of issues in the community that we are still avoiding like environmental issues.
- There are a lot of houses in the Marina – we just need to make it affordable
- There are a lot of homeowners that have multiple homes in the Presidio and Marina and don’t even live there and the homes are just vacant.

Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)
- Old buildings and warehouses turned into new houses.
- On the back of 3rd street there is a street called Ingalls St and there is a bunch of warehouses/industrial area.
- Ingleside
- Bayview
- Near St. Ignatius, towards the water, it’s nice but really cold.

Black community, Fillmore/WA (FG 10)
- The distribution of housing needs to be corrected.
- Western side of SF

Black community, OMI (FG 11)
- They could do it here, enhancing our community.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Bayview (FG 12) [Home owners’ perspective]
- Ingleside
- Central location
- Safe location. Silver Avenue, Ocean Avenue, Third Street, Sunset, Richmond or Oceanside
- Where there is available land, they should build there.
- Different options for different priorities.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Richmond (FG 13)
- Not in the Richmond - you’ll cast a shadow onto other people’s property or block the light
- There’s not a lot of space left

Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 14)
- Ensure fair distribution of benefits
- Transit corridors
- The city needs to even out their development patterns.

Moderate to very low-income community in the Sunset neighborhood (FG 15)
- Not on 25th or 26th Ave and Taraval to avoid blocking views
- Put taller multifamily housing on top of all the hills
- increase housing on the Westside and along transit lines

Cantonese-speaking community in the Tenderloin (FG 16)
- Every neighborhood should have some affordable units where you only pay 30% of income on rent.
- There are many under-utilized sites that might be parking that aren’t being used. If you identify
those sites, we should tell Planning so that we can discuss building more housing there.
• The Sunset is fine, the Richmond is fine
• Wherever we can build, we should build

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x seniors (FG 17)
• Distributed throughout the city, there needs to be a balance
• In the Mission
• If you make the housing in those places where the American [reference to Caucasian and/or wealthier families] lives, we won’t feel welcome. We feel rejected.
• Our children were born here, they also need affordable housing, to can aspire to have a home near the Golden Gate.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families & youth (FG 18)
• Excelsior
• Any side of town if it’s a better place
• Not in the Mission (already too crowded) or the Tenderloin (not safe)

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families, Excelsior (FG 19)
• The West
• Sunset, Ocean Ave., Excelsior and Taraval Ave.

Japanese American community, Japantown (FG 20)
• Two lots owned by the Nihonmachi Corporation (behind JT Bowl). They [corporation] solicited proposal and actively looking at what to do with this lot.
• Another lot is the MPC Lot (near Laguna St) – one of the last open land spaces.
• Buchanan Hotel can be turned into a co-op or affordable housing.
• This is my home and I don’t want to go anywhere else.
• New housing development should also include the South of Geary St, Japantown included 42 blocks with a lot of history.
• Landlords planned to build condominiums over the commercial area and we should support in some way.
• Including JARF in the discussion would have been useful they do oversee the Nihonmachi Terrace and those buildings around that area to. Opportunity in parking lots nearby

Moderate to very low-income community in the Richmond (FG 21)
• Richmond
• Increasing density in low-density neighborhoods

Moderate to very low-income community, Western (FG 22)
• Taller multifamily housing on top of all the hills
• Increase housing on the Westside including Sunset, Richmond
• Along transit lines
• The challenge is people who cry Not in my back yard

12. Cost of living

CONVERGING IDEAS
A majority of participants agree that San Francisco’s high cost of living underlies the housing crisis, with inequitable outcomes for working families, very low- and moderate-income communities, seniors, youth, communities of color, and other vulnerable families and individuals. Sources of income that are accessible to these communities have not kept up with a raising cost of living, resulting in negative impacts to quality of life. Participants shared that to make ends meet, they are forced to hold multiple jobs and accept longer commutes, which in turn negatively impacts their health and the educational outcomes of their children. Already vulnerable families and individuals are exposed to unsanitary and overcrowding housing conditions, that breed domestic violence, abuse, and mental health problems.

Participants mentioned that households with seasonal incomes, informal jobs, new immigrants, seniors, and families and individuals with no income, are increasingly vulnerable to challenges related to cost of living and housing.

There is the perception that only high-tech industry workers have been able to afford decent housing in San Francisco. Participants expressed that “affordable housing is not actually affordable to us”. Housing policy decisions need to be made in the context of overall affordability and cost of living, which includes other basic household expenses such as childcare, groceries, and utilities. Immigrant families have the additional cost of supporting family
members in other countries. Participants considered necessary to cap rent and housing costs to a percentage of income (some participants mentioned 30%, others 50%) to help families and individuals access and maintain their housing.

OTHER IDEAS
Participants expressed a need to review/ redefine guidelines of what is considered affordable housing and to whom based on a comprehensive approach to the costs of living in San Francisco.

When planning to build new housing, the City should create policies to ensure living expenses (i.e., food, transportation) are affordable and accessible to families and individuals moving into a new neighborhood, and that they remain affordable to those already living in the neighborhood.

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

LGBTQ+ Youth/ Mental health providers (FG 1)
• Create policies that make sure that the cost of living stays low/ not only starts low.

Seniors (FG 2)
• Income isn’t keeping up with rent.
• Seniors don’t have income, just Social Security.

Filipino community (FG 4)
• Housing should be a 100% affordable below market rate; profits should not be made out of new housing development.

American Indian community (FG 5)
• Only the high-tech industry has been able to afford a decent apartment here in this city. People working for non-profit organizations aren’t able to afford just the one-bedroom apartment. The cost of housing in the city is outrageous and it is very inequitable for hard working families.

Transitional youth (FG 7)
• Rent has to be under half of what you make, we need accessible payment of rent to maintain that housing
• Also need to take into account with housing placement is will folks be able to afford food in those neighborhoods.

Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)
• Living in SF is expensive, not only young people but older people are struggling, people have two or three jobs just to pay rent.

Black community, OMI (FG 11)
• The new affordable housing is not actually affordable to us, but you see people of other races paying $5,000 to $7,000.

Black community, Fillmore/WA (FG 10)
• Rents there are still kind of high for affordable housing, including the lottery. The new buildings are not for us and are not affordable.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Richmond (FG 13)
• There are so many more costs to owning a house beyond the mortgage
• The cost of living now is just way too high. San Francisco’s living cost keeps going up while income/wages are staying the same
• Even if the government gave a house some people wouldn’t be able to afford it.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 14)
• My income from work doesn’t really cover my rent.
• New immigrants treat renting housing as a huge challenge.
• People don’t have enough money to buy a house, and income isn’t stable enough to get a mortgage.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families & youth (FG 18)
• Increase opportunities where there really is the right to housing, people are really stressed by the rent. Families should only pay a given percentage of their income as rent.
• Living in other places like Oakland can be cheaper, but there is also a lot of sacrifice having to travel every day to SF for work. Commuting could also be a burden in terms of time and money.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families, Excelsior (FG 19)
• One prefers to live with less space but knowing that it is affordable.
They're saying it's accessible [affordable] to people who don't have money, but in the apartment you never see people walking out from the buildings, all the people who are moving into these apartments [affordable housing] have cars. Why do they live in those apartments? And they are paying less and we who have no money are paying much more rent than they do.

Japanese American community, Japantown (FG 20)
Affordability is key issue; many people feel they have been ‘priced out’ of the area. Over the last ten years there have been nothing close to JT in terms of affordable housing units.

Moderate to very low-income community in the Richmond (FG 21)
Low income and middle-income people are struggling to find and maintain rent in San Francisco.

13. Work Opportunities

CONVERGING IDEAS
In several instances, the topic of work opportunities converged with cost of living and affordability. Participants agreed that while a lack of affordable housing continues to push families and individuals out of existing job markets, more and better paid job opportunities are needed for families and individuals to afford housing and maintain housing.

This topic was particularly important to young participants (FG 7 & 8), and Spanish-speaking youth, families and seniors (many of whom are still employed due to a lack of access to retirement opportunities). Groups including immigrants, TAY, and seniors, need more support finding income generating opportunities. For these communities, generating a steady income to cover the cost of living in San Francisco is particularly challenging due to experience requirements, language barriers, unresolved immigration status, and the seasonal/informal aspect of many of the jobs they can access. Young participants would like to have more support finding and preparing for a job (training and education).

Accessing job opportunities with limited public transit options remains a challenge to many communities. Participants from Southeast San Francisco as well as the Sunset, described how their neighborhoods remain disconnected from job opportunities, with few reliable public transit options available to them. The creation of new local jobs should be considered with new housing opportunities. This approach could also help reduce pressure on public transit, reduce traffic, shorten commutes, and improve overall quality of life.

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

Transitional youth (FG 7)
- Especially for TAY still live with their parents, some need to leave their houses because they are an extra expense to their families. But without a steady income or a good job is impossible to find a place in San Francisco.
- It is hard to find a job in South East San Francisco. When looking for a elsewhere in the city is hard to get to work because there are few bus lines that run through Southeast San Francisco.

Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)
- Actions that can be taken now are not only to supply housing but affordability – lack of affordable housing pushes people out of job markets. So, more job opportunities for the youth and where to find these opportunities.

Moderate to very low-income community in the Sunset neighborhood (FG 15)
- We need jobs in the Sunset if you want to provide people with good housing or attract folks here to better their lives.
- Prioritizing locals for employment in local institutions (such as schools) would be helpful and decrease traffic/commutes

Cantonese-speaking community in the Tenderloin (FG 16)
- For those who can work, we should encourage them to find a job rather than providing free food and accommodation.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families & youth (FG 18)
- A job in San Francisco living in Oakland kills you mentally and physically.
Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families, Excelsior (FG 19)

- That the City gives work without asking for experience, it is very difficult to find a job with what happened (COVID). Undocumented people are afraid to apply to jobs because they don’t have the experience and papers [permanent resident status].
- It affects you morally and live with fear that employers ask for papers. Many work with papeles de chocolate (fake id’s) because it’s the only way they can work.

14. Transparency and trust

CONVERGING IDEAS
Participants described how a lack of transparency and accountability in housing-related programs and processes creates an environment of generalized distrust of public agencies. This environment, combined with a lack of progress in uplifting vulnerable communities, is contributing to a pervasive sense that “other” community groups are receiving all the benefits.

Participants consider that there is a need for real and urgent action in housing-related matters. There is a sense that new development “brings money to the city’s pockets”, but delivers no benefits to their communities. Participants mentioned that Planning is incentivised to prioritize the interests of developers, rather than the “needs of tenants and low-income people”. The Planning Department’s funding structure and relationship to developers adds to a perception corruption and conflict of interest within the Department. Similarly, some participants made reference to developers’ “divide and conquer tactics” within communities and believe Planning has a role in preventing these situations.

Participants agree that Planning and the city should honor past commitments to communities that have been harmed by discriminatory policies. Participants belonging to the American Indian community made reference to the Relocation Program, which promised to provide housing, while Japanese American participants agreed that the right to return should honor Certificates of Preference granted to Japanese American Families.

Existing housing programs need to be reformed to provide accountability and transparency. Programs should offer results, work with deadlines, audits, and adequate oversight. Negligence in case management should be addressed. Participants expressed frustration and distrust of the housing lottery system: it is “difficult to understand how decisions are made”, and assigning housing should not be “a matter of luck”. Participants think that better communication of the stories of families and individuals successfully housed will build trust with the community.

Finally, participants expressed the need to continue to raise awareness on how systemic racism, discriminatory policies, and economic inequality contribute to the housing crisis. Everyone plays a role in either perpetuating or solving this issue: “People with money don’t see themselves as part of the problem- there is a lack of understanding and desire to really change something very deep and fundamental in humanity, in equity, and [in contradiction with the image that America projects]”.

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

LGBTQ+ Youth/ Mental health providers (FG 1)
- ONE system for housing – the intention was to simplify the process, but it ended up being a not so transparent system. So it is very difficult to understand how decisions have been made. Not working well for the folks that need housing.
- Develop system of accountability for people working in the ONE system. Need to develop better practices to treat people with dignity.

Seniors (FG 2)
- San Francisco has all these policies that don’t fulfil its promises. Every time people fight for a bigger percentage of housing, there’s a clause that says the developer can take that percentage away and pay to not have to provide low-income housing.
- Planning is not oriented towards tenants and low-income people, but developers. They’re funded by developers, which means that Planning is always talking about expediting projects. Planning needs to look into funding from other sources to take away that interest.
- Nonprofit developers have not been able to do all the projects they want to because the City has not prioritized those sites for affordable housing.
People with disabilities (FG 3)
- I called the Housing Authority to see where I was on the waitlist, and they said there were no numbers, just a waitlist.
- There’s no response to lotteries, you never hear if you don’t get something. Who knows who’s getting that housing.
- There is a feeling of unequal access to programs, as some members of the Black community considered there are roadmaps in place for Asian or Latino communities.

Filipino community (FG 4)
- People with money doesn’t see themselves as part of the problem- there is a lack of understanding and desire to really change something very deep and fundamental in humanity, in equity, and [in contradiction with the image that America projects].
- Process needs deadlines, audits [accountability]. Address negligence in case management.
- Developers also reach out to community organisations to try to endorse their proposals and divide and conquer tactics [within the community].

American Indian community (FG 5)
- Something that would be more simplified, welcoming and that doesn’t take years to have follow up.
- Accountability of these agencies and know there is preference if you work in the city or you live in the city.
- Planning needs to be accountable and get PR in order they have to get the information out there the way you want it to be heard.
- Share stories on what worked for families or community members and build trust with the community.
- Families of our community are in San Francisco through the Relocation Program. Part of that deal was the government would help with housing but not many families got help with housing.
- The American Indian community know that the data that has been put together is wrong and non-representative of the community.

Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)
- Systems in place are not working – they are not keeping up with clients or following up- There is a need for a lot of work within institutions to roll out these plans. There is need for more accountability of institutions.

Black community, Fillmore/WA (FG 10)
- Nothing that Planning is doing is for us, they are building more buildings to get more money into the city’s pocket.
- Rents there are still kind of high for affordable housing, including the lottery. The new buildings are not for us and are not affordable.

Black community, OMI (FG 11)
- You are getting a lot of powerful, authentic information from the people in this room (SF State student, City workers, seniors, TAY).
- ‘Talk is cheap’ and there is a need for quick action. In a couple years there won’t be any people of the community left. We need action immediately.
- There’s program after program and no accountability.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Bayview (FG 12)
- Rejection of applications should be more transparent. There is a need for a notification and explanation on why the applications was not successful.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 14)
- More transparency on the housing lottery/distribution process, community organization that monitors the government’s spending and activities.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x seniors (FG 17)
- The community feel suspicious about the program as few people of none are really receiving any support on housing.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families & youth (FG 18)
- The lottery process is fine but it’s also needed a committee that follows up on cases because when you do not reach the requirements, or something is missing, support applicants, see why and not just remove it.
• More transparency of the process, and reporting to who they gave it to. Because when only a group of people are selected for an apartment when nobody of us was there you feel inequality and discrimination.

15. Powerlessness and revictimization

CONVERGING IDEAS

There is a generalized sense of frustration and disappointment among participants. Participants shared housing-related experiences that have left them feeling unheard, overwhelmed, exhausted, and powerless to improve housing challenges that seem “insurmountable”. “No matter how much you work you cannot change your outcomes”.

Participants described interactions with “government” housing programs as being dehumanizing and undignifying. This is due to barriers of access, as well as a lack of empathy from program staff and decision-makers. Increasing representation from vulnerable communities in staffing of housing-related programs was mentioned as an opportunity to generate greater empathy and more equitable outcomes. Participants also mentioned the need to increase supports and guidance for housing-related programs, improve outreach, education, and timely dissemination of information.

Some participants reflected on the stigma attached to accessing government funded housing programs. Vulnerable or at-risk participants spoke of seeking alternative solutions to their urgent housing needs, rather than seeking support from government housing programs that have failed, disappointed, or victimized them in the past. Participants recounted accepting housing without contracts and/or in overcrowded conditions, taking on debt, moving away from sources of employment, and having no alternative but to step into unhealthy/abusive interpersonal relationships that increase their risk of revictimization.

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

Seniors (FG 2)

• I began to see the injustice. I’ve seen it grown worse and worse. There’s no care or concern for people in general, no matter who they are, to find housing.

People with disabilities (FG 3)

• It is disingenuous to have people that have not been in your position to decide what kind of housing is going to be made for those that are downtrodden

American Indian community (FG 5)

• I’ve been on the waiting list [for affordable housing] and it seems like it takes forever. I signed up in 2001 and still to this date there’s no follow up, which is frustrating.

• The biggest frustration for me is the application process, the follow up, gathering all the documents is overwhelming.

LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)

• Housing has become a commodity that you can profit from instead of a safe place for housing people.

• It’s more profitable to have a house sit empty than rent it. It feels like a game of monopoly, it feels insurmountable when you’re going up against so much money. It’s such an unfair system, and I’d like to collapse it all. I feel really powerless over it.

Transitional youth (FG 7)

• Government officials should actually try to help you while you apply for housing – I’ve had bad experiences with California governmental assistance.

• Rental assistance makes unhoused people jump through hoops like documentation to proof they need assistance, which is a dehumanizing process

Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)

• The organizations that exist are not getting to the young people properly, these [the organizations] are doing the bare minimum when it comes to outreach, when it comes to serving us, they are scared to come to the neighborhoods, they are scared to talk to us about what they have to offer [the youth].
Black community, Bayview (FG 9)
• I work all the time, but I still don’t have the money in my account for a down payment.

Black community, Fillmore/WA (FG 10)
• If you don’t know where to start it is very discouraging when you have children and then you have pre-teens and going to a shelter.
• A lot of people don’t reach out because they feel they will be judged.
• The houses that are being built in the orange areas (opportunity areas), those are not for us, they are for the google people, for twitter people and tourists. They are to accommodate the money they want in this area.

Black community, OMI (FG 11)
• On Brighton Ave., I’ve seen evicted people sitting with all their belongings. It’s so sad.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Tenderloin (FG 16)
• My landlord recently gave me an eviction notice because the landlord wants to take the unit back. I’m facing the possibility of homelessness, which is why this topic is so important to me.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x seniors (FG 17)
• I signed up for the housing lottery and I was told I was eligible. I was very happy because you are used to being in one room or living with many people. The good thing is that I did not tell my landlady because later I was told that I was no longer eligible [exceeded income threshold]. It was a disappointment for the family, it was very hard, one gets frustrated.
• So how are we going to be able to access decent housing if for one, two, or three dollars we no longer qualify. They make us get our hopes up for nothing, and we did so much work filling out forms.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families & youth (FG 18)
• The right to housing is not that you are going to have the right I think it is the luck you are going to have.
• So many requirements and you reach the frustration that you give up.
• I am not in the contract, and that is why my voice does not count and I do not have access to a mailbox, [my landlord] gives me my correspondence when they want. This frustrates one because I have to wait, if you are not in the contract you can’t comment.
• The ‘Gift to SF’ was a disaster, we had to fill and fill applications so that after that the resources are very little. And those people are still waiting and people don’t know that the program is closed for more than a year (Gift to SF).
• We’re all embarrassed… we have a lot of pride, we as Latinos [we think we should] find our way on our own. We are used to working, working, working and when there is help, we move it to one side. We don’t take advantage of the opportunity when it’s there.

Moderate to very low-income community in the Richmond (FG 21)
• People feel their situation is unsustainable for the long term and that they will need to leave their current neighborhoods.

16. Education and Guidance

CONVERGING IDEAS
Participants consider that the City should improve methods to disseminate information and provide educational opportunities for communities to learn about existing City resources and programs related to housing. Vulnerable communities, in unstable housing situations or financially stressed, are not exposed to the resources they need in a timely and culturally appropriate manner (includes in-language resources).

Participants suggested that the City and Planning could collaborate with a network of trusted community partners and institutions to provide access to information and educational opportunities related to housing. Participants also suggested that this information could be provided in schools to reach younger generations and families. Additional guidance is needed with applications (i.e., housing applications), and following up on outcomes and updates, this guidance should be provided by City staff.

As well as learning about existing housing-related programs and resources, communities need support
learning how to navigate "the system", which was used to describe a wide range of government-related processes that have a community interface. The following educational topics were mentioned:

• The history of discriminatory policies within the context of housing (i.e., redlining).
• Rights in general, and specifically tenants' rights and contracts.
• Wealth creation: real estate, rental, homeownership, equity, and income.
• Financial literacy needed to enter the workforce (401K, I-9 forms), pay off loans, or apply for housing (credit scores).
• Affordable housing resources, and guidance with applications.

PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY

American Indian community (FG 5)
• A lot of people are not informed because the resources are so limited.

Transitional youth (FG 7)
• [Providing] knowledge about homeownership should start young. People should know how to go about housing, how to own property.

Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)
• There is a need for education on the existing resources. People are in a survival mode and are not exposed to the resources they need
• Better education system, not only going to school but actually learning the system. Classes on how to work around financial assistance (401K, I-9 forms), understand rent and how to get a home, pay off loans, credit scores or how to apply for jobs.

Black community, Bayview (FG 9)
• People need to be educated

Black community, Fillmore/WA (FG 10)
• Community Centers like Booker T. or Ella Hutch can provide resources and give these resources it would be an increase of interest of housing.

Black community, OMI (FG 11)
• Education should lead to wealth. They should teach about how to buy a house and land. Teach about discrimination and history of discrimination within the context of housing, like redlining.
• Education makes all the difference. It changes quality of life and what you can afford to do
• Teach about housing in school (about real estate, rental, homeownership, equity, and income in this community).
• Tenant and resident responsibility need to be taught.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 14)
• It's very difficult to apply for housing independently – if you need to know English, fill out forms, so on.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families & youth (FG 18)
• We need workshops for children or parents to learn about the programs and resources that exist.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families, Excelsior (FG 19)
• People did not know any of these programs, it is very important the information they are sharing, because they gained more knowledge.
• Hispanic families do not know how to apply,
• Community centers to inform about rights as Hispanics, support with children, housing, food, a center like FCC. [Communities that are informed find a way forward].

17. Equal opportunities/ Barriers to access affordable housing opportunities

CONVERGING IDEAS

Participants shared their experiences with housing-related government programs and policies. There is a generalized perception existing programs discriminate against certain communities, that opportunities are unattainable (low chances of success, too many barriers), and that affordable housing is not being granted to those who need it most. Some of the most common barriers to access affordable housing mentioned by participants, are described below.

The extent and type of documentation required to rent and apply for affordable housing is a major
barrier for many communities including families, youth, immigrant communities, seniors, formerly incarcerated individuals, and communities with seasonal, variable income, or informal employment. For young participants, not being able to show a credit history is a major barrier. Individuals with seasonal/informal jobs are denied opportunities for not being able to demonstrate a steady income. Latino families mentioned being denied housing because they have children, facing landlord discrimination for using rent vouchers, and being forced to accept housing without a contract because, for instance, they cannot show a resolved immigration status. Many Latino families are not cognisant of tenant rights and government housing programs, or prefer not to make use of them as they live in fear of government and landlords. Participants agree that requirements should match families’ and individuals’ abilities to provide such requirements.

Several participants mentioned instances of having been selected in the affordable housing lottery only to be told later that they did not meet or exceed the required income thresholds and losing their eligibility. Other barriers include: length of the application process, clarity of process and communications, language barriers, unreasonable response times and means of contacting applicants. Applying to affordable housing is a burdensome and overwhelming process, and families and individuals need to reapply every time a new opportunity is available. Participants would like to see a “universal application process” that gets updated if applicants’ needs or goals change and provides a “unique housing waitlist number”. Other participants suggested limiting the number of applications per property to give applicants a greater chance of success. Once housed, families and individuals can enter a separate “housing ladder” process that will allow them to access opportunities over time as their needs change but will not compete with first-time applicants.

A lack of transparency in housing-related programs adds to an environment of distrust of public agencies and to a sense that “other” community groups are receiving the benefits. However, participants agree that housing programs should prioritize the most vulnerable groups. Participants also mentioned first-time applicants, native San Franciscans and long-time residents, and those who have been in waitlists the longest could be prioritized. Transparency in prioritization criteria, selection, and overall process is required.

Overall, participants agree on the need to make more affordable housing available to everyone, including building new affordable, government subsidized housing, and reforming affordable housing programs. To participants, equity in housing programs will require prioritization, transparency, accountability, and supports to meet the needs and circumstances of vulnerable community groups. These supports should include advisors that can actively remove barriers (for instance, support with transportation, guide applicants, provide regular updates and advocate on their behalf).

**DIVERGING IDEAS**

Participants from the Cantonese-speaking focus group in the Richmond shared thoughts on housing-related government programs and policies from the homeowners’ perspective. Participants perceive the governments’ protection of tenants (tenants’ rights and rent control) as “unequal”. Some property owners mentioned that property taxes higher than what they are able to collect in rent from their tenants.

**PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY**

**People with disabilities (FG 3)**

- I don’t like the lottery system because it allows people outside of the city to play. There should be some sort of priority for San Francisco residents.
- The lottery is hard. Most of the seniors applying for housing are already in housing and just want different housing. What about people on the waiting list, do they ever have a chance at housing?
- The city should regulate who they’re leasing to in their city-owned SROs. The nicer SROs with kitchenettes are going to a certain group – there are no Blacks in those buildings.
- Especially if you’ve been unhoused for a long time, you’re not going to have documents and paperwork ready right away to fill out applications.
- We have no exit plan for those in jail, which is 70% black and brown males. No resources or
transitional housing, again no entry system. 900 inmates currently have two case managers

- People need a unique housing wait list number
- There is a feeling of unequal access to programs, as some members of the Black community considered there are roadmaps in place for Asian or Latino communities.

American Indian community (FG 5)
- The Lottery is bad because they ask you for a certain amount of income and every time that people say ‘oh there is housing opening’ they only accept people that already have housing.
- The lottery is not good; people attend meetings and then they hear that the housing has already been given to somebody else. People believe that the lottery was decided way before you even attended. They are suspicious about the process and system.
- They should drop that [lottery system] and just be able to apply for it and just make it an easy transition and not based only on what your credit is supposed to be when you already know that you can pay your rent every single month and not have a problem.

LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)
- When you have a varying income, it is hard to qualify for affordable housing. How can you thrive financially when it means you can no longer afford to live here?
- People come from all over the world who are fleeing for safety. The ways in which people enter and stay in the Castro are a challenge. I was only able to find a place because I found a rent controlled, relatively affordable unit. I was only able to access that because I came from a middle-class family and could access privilege through connections to white queer men in a nightlife career.
- City housing is so impacted for all people, that it’s difficult to set any aside specifically for LGBTQ people where our culture is the norm.
- People who are paying market rate are for all practical purposes really unable of being human and compassionate with people of low incomes.

Transitional youth (FG 7)
- Extra support [is needed] to help families and at-risk individuals apply for these things or understand these things in general.
- Some categorization creates barriers for resources and divide people. Ensuring that it goes to people of low-income communities or at risk of losing their homes

Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)
- Difficulties for young people to find housing – lack of credits to get accepted for housing. It’s more about who is willing to give young people the opportunity to get housed.

Black community, Bayview (FG 9)
- The Asian community just received 50 million in reparations after less than 6 months of their hardship, not the murders that are happening in our community. They didn’t have to wait no 8-10 year to get no result. But we as a black nation of people always gotta come and wait years. I’m rising my people. Ruth Williams said, when I rise, my people will rise.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Bayview (FG 12)
- People who haven’t been here as long get a spot first. Can the lottery process be changed so that there’s consideration of age or how long you’ve been applying?

Cantonese-speaking community in the Richmond (FG 13)
- Because of government laws, it’s so difficult to evict a tenant. I have a tenant that is paying $1,300, which doesn’t even cover the property taxes, and I can’t even evict them.
- San Francisco is very unequal – property taxes are high and the government protects tenants.

Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 14)
- Hope they also don’t limit housing to low-income or middle-income, but give everyone the opportunity to apply for housing. Sometimes it’s a very small difference between the low- and middle-income thresholds.
- Many apartments don’t rent out to people who are low-income and have children.
- Don’t set the affordable housing application income minimums so high and maximums so low. Don’t leave the requirements so stringent that it makes applying difficult and hard for people to qualify
• It’s also hard that all the documents are all in English, there’s no Chinese

Cantonese-speaking community in the Tenderloin (FG 16)
• A universal application system for housing, like they do for schools. If you apply once, then your information is with the government. Then, whenever there’s a housing opportunity, you’re entered for the lottery and at some point will get something.
• The system can’t just be based on luck each time. There should be some sort of order
• Since the homeless people are already in our city, and we see their needs, we should also give them a hand.
• People who already have a good place to live, should not keep applying for other housing.
• When receiving applications for affordable housing, the City should prioritize on the applicants who do not have affordable housing yet, also should prioritize on the applicants that have been living in the U.S. longer.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x seniors (FG 17)
• ‘I applied to the lottery when apartments were available near Cesar Chavez, it turned out that not a single Latino was given housing’
• The Chinese community is quite supportive and when they see a Latino, unfortunately, they support their people.
• We have the perception that they don’t give it [the apartments] to us because we’re Latino.
• Then also that affordable apartments are built to buy [not only to rent] for our community. Because, why not choose to buy, we don’t want to rent all the time.
• People perceive those new buildings classified as low-income are sold to people not originally from SF.

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families & youth (FG 18)
• A building takes the lottery out for two or three apartments, but thousands of applications are put in, is a game they have with our community. ‘When I applied it turned out that I was number 5000. If there are going to be 10 units they should only ask for 50 applications to have more possibilities. Filling out the application is a lot of work’.
• When applying for affordable housing they are asking for information that I had to go really out of my way to look for. They want proof of everything, they could have made this process a bit easier for me.
• Advisors to help people with applications and to continue insisting and to take you by the hand. Sometimes even transportation is a limitation, knowing where the place is, or having proof of payment (I get paid with cash).

Spanish-speaking, Latino/x families, Excelsior (FG 19)
• Variety (like in different options) of documents that are requested to rent, because there are many who do not have the documents they require to rent, that is a very strong obstacle.
• There are people that have been applying, they have been there for years and they have not been given anything.
• Sometimes tenant does not want to give you the property because they think that if you have a voucher you will not be able to pay the rent. We didn’t use the existing support for fear that they would not give us the apartment.

Japanese American community, Japantown (FG 20)
• Housing is not isolated from other inequities (a plan that can be looked from many dimensions)

18. Justice

CONVERGING IDEAS
Participants expressed the need for a housing system that is just, driven by equity, humanizing, and where everyone is treated with dignity. Each applicant should be considered and provided options that match their needs and goals. Everyone should have access to housing that dignifies them as human beings, and where they can feel safe. To thrive, vulnerable communities require access to housing as well as other supports to navigate government systems, generate a steady income, and access services such as healthcare or childcare.

Many of the participants shared their personal experiences of harms caused by discriminatory housing policy and systems. More work is needed in
partnership with communities to identify the harms, and dismantle housing-related systems and policies perpetuating such harms. It is important to note that for many communities these harms are present experiences. San Francisco could start by repairing the harms caused by discriminatory policy that led to the displacement of American India, Black, Filipino, and Japanese American communities. Other communities undergoing recent displacement resulting from economic inequality (global and local) such as immigrant and Latino communities, seniors, families, and youth, should also be considered.

Participants are aware of the need to dismantle biases by increasing cultural competency across communities, and to create spaces for alliances between different communities “where people can be human together”.

Environmental justice: Bayview and Excelsior residents experience a very different quality of life from residents in the Marina. The Planning Department should develop policy and be accountable to addressing the environmental and health-related burdens that these communities continue to bear.

**PROMINENT IDEAS BY TARGET COMMUNITY**

**Seniors (FG 2)**
- There’s no care or concern for people in general, no matter who they are, to find housing.

**People with disabilities (FG 3)**
- No person with disability/mobility issues should be forced to live in a building with no elevator or accessible and correctly designed units.
- Black people are dying to get housing.

**Filipino community (FG 4)**
- [The housing crisis] is rooted in capitalism itself. Anti-homeless infrastructure, like park benches, [the City] are sort of criminalizing the homeless – Is there any change?
- Inequities created by the exploitation of labor. This country has been founded on inequities not only here but in other countries, but now it is coming to here. [Ecological devastation of the Philippines, resources that support the super-profits of tech and further inequities]

**LGBTQ+ community (FG 6)**
- In 30 years, if no work has been done to address hateful beliefs, when we are put together in these buildings, the hate will be concentrated. A lot of work still to do to get to a place where we can be human together.

**Transitional youth (FG 7)**
- People who live in the Marina and westside of the city experience a totally different San Francisco than people in Excelsior, etc. And that’s not fair, that’s a huge macro aggression.
- For every houseless person, there’s 7 vacant houses. The city should acquire these houses and turned those into affordable units.

**Transitional youth, Bayview (FG 8)**
- Everyone should have opportunities (equity different from equality).

**Black community, OMI (FG 11)**
- The Redevelopment Agency caused some of this development pattern in San Francisco. It was addressing crime and blight, and caused thousands of Black people to be displaced
- The Redevelopment Agency evicted people from their homes in the Western Addition and it stayed vacant for 20 years

**Cantonese-speaking community in the Sunset (FG 14)**
- Don’t just give them a house, make sure they’re offered services that encourage productivity and working.
APPENDIX B.
Focus Group Menu of Questions

Instructions: Thank you for partnering with SF Planning to co-facilitate a focus group in your community as part of the second phase of outreach for the Housing Element Update 2022. Below you will find a menu of questions that cover the major policy shifts included in the first draft of the Housing Element published in April 2021. Please select 2-3 questions that would be most relevant to the participants nominated by your CBO and feel welcome to suggest edits.

Major policy shifts and overview of focus group topics
The major policy shifts in the Housing Elements are focused on vulnerable groups, as defined by the Department of Public Health:

Here is an overview of topics and questions for the focus group (additional context can be found in the following pages):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic 1: Repairing the harm from racial and social discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right to housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>What do you think ‘recognizing the right to housing’ should mean?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritizing un-housed/ at-risk families and individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Which actions or combination of actions have the potential to be most effective in helping un-housed or at-risk families and individuals in the short and mid-term?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Which actions are most likely to prevent further displacement?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would ‘right to return’ mean for your community?

Empowering communities
What kind of community engagement process would be needed to ensure your community is empowered to guide, monitor, and implement policies and actions included in the Housing Element?

Topic 2: Building new housing in inclusive and healthy neighborhoods

Building new housing in inclusive neighborhoods
What type of new housing would you like to see built in your community? Who should this new housing be for?

Where should we build new housing?

Strengthening neighborhood amenities and infrastructure
What type of amenities and public infrastructure investments should be prioritized to prepare neighborhoods to receive more housing?

Supporting middle and moderate income households
How should the City invest public funding to support moderate and middle-income families and individuals?

Do you think a streamlined project approval process is a helpful approach to ensure privately built housing serves moderate and middle-income households?

Continued engagement
What would be the best way to approach community engagement for new housing in your community? What has or hasn’t worked in the past?

Topic 1- Repairing the harm from discrimination

1a- Recognizing right to housing
The 2022 Housing Element will be the first update centered on racial and social equity; it could also be the first policy document in San Francisco to recognize the right to housing.

Potential focus group question:

• What do you think ‘recognizing the right to housing’ should mean?

1b- Prioritizing un-housed/at-risk families and individuals
The draft Housing Element identifies a number of actions that aim to prioritize the needs of unhoused or at-risk families and individuals.
Draft 1 of the Housing element includes the following actions:

- Building permanently supportive housing.
- Building homeless shelters and navigation centers throughout the city, including off-street Safe Parking sites for vehicle dwellers seeking conventional housing.
- Identify and prioritize vulnerable groups for placement in temporary shelters and permanent supportive housing.
- Expand on-site and mobile case management and services for the most vulnerable.

Potential focus group question:

- Which of these actions or combination of actions have potential to be most effective in helping these families and individuals in the short and mid-term? What other concrete actions should the City take?

1c- Community stability: Preventing further displacement

The draft Housing Element proposes stabilizing communities through anti-displacement policies and actions focused on neighborhoods with higher concentration of low-income communities of color, vulnerable groups, and areas undergoing displacement.
Draft 1 of the Housing element includes the following actions for neighborhoods with a higher concentration of low-income communities of color:

Increasing financial supports
- Rental assistance (housing vouchers).
- Targeted down-payment assistance loans.

Increasing deeply affordable housing opportunities
- Assigning priority in affordable housing lottery.
- Building new permanently affordable housing on City-owned land.
- Preserving affordable housing (i.e. purchase and rehabilitation of SRO buildings).
- Prioritizing approval of development projects serving extremely low and very low-income families and individuals.
- Pursuing alternative types of ownership (i.e. community ownership, co-housing, limited equity, stewardship, and land trust models).

Strengthening neighborhood amenities and public infrastructure
- Increasing funding for community-based organizations providing tenant protection and anti-displacement support.
- Prioritizing investments to improve public transit, environmental quality, open space access and quality, and community amenities.

Potential focus group questions:
- Which actions from Draft 1 of the Housing Element are most likely to prevent further displacement?

1d- Community stability: Bringing back displaced communities
In the first round of outreach for the Housing Element Update, community members expressed the need to explore ‘right to return’ opportunities for those displaced by discriminatory programs such as red lining, Urban Renewal, Japanese Internment, and Indian Relocation Act. These programs contributed to the displacement of American Indian, Black, Japanese, and Filipino communities. Draft 1 of the Housing Element update includes several policies that attempt to acknowledge and redress displaced communities.

Draft 1 of the Housing element includes the following actions:
- Prioritizing and targeting select vulnerable groups for affordable homeownership opportunities programs.
- Dedicating land to American Indian Communities.
• Pursuing alternative types of ownership that put land in community hands (i.e. community ownership, co-housing, limited equity, stewardship, and land trust models).
• Strengthening cultural anchors and connections including investing in the Cultural District program.

Potential focus group questions:

• What would ‘right to return’ mean for your community?

1e- Empowering communities

Draft 1 of the Housing element includes the following actions:

• Targeted engagement and elevated representation of American Indian, Black, and other Communities of Color in decision making bodies such as Community Advisory Councils (CACs).
• Investing in community-led planning efforts:
  o Cultural District strategic planning.
  o Working in partnership with CBOs serving and representing American Indian, Black, other People of Color, and other vulnerable groups.

Potential focus group questions:

• What kind of community engagement process would be needed to ensure your community is empowered to guide, monitor and implement policies and actions related to housing?

Topic 2- Building new housing in inclusive and healthy neighborhoods

2a- Building new housing in inclusive neighborhoods

New housing has been primarily concentrated in neighborhoods on the east side of the City.
The Housing Element Update is considering distributing new housing more evenly across the City in order to:

- Reduce the burden of change from concentrating new development in neighborhoods with a higher concentration of low-income communities of color.
- Provide increased affordable housing options for low-income communities of color in their own neighborhoods, but also in neighborhoods that have higher quality amenities.

Evenly distributing new housing across the City could mean increased height and density along rapid bus and rail corridors such as Geary Blvd., Judah Street, 19th Ave., Lombard Street, Ocean Ave., Taraval Street, West Portal Ave., and Van Ness Ave or within the higher-income and low-density residential neighborhoods.
Potential focus group questions:
- What type of new housing would you like to see built in your community? Who should this new housing be for?
- What are your thoughts on the pattern of growth proposed above?
- Where should we build new housing?

2b- Strengthening neighborhood amenities and public infrastructure
Higher-income and low-density residential corridors and neighborhoods described in the last question often maintain high quality amenities, environment and resources such as schools, parks, commercial corridors, and frequent transit. These amenities and resources can help support healthy families and upward mobility for vulnerable groups.

Potential focus group questions:
- What type of amenities and public infrastructure investments should be prioritized to better prepare these neighborhoods to receive more housing?

2c- Supporting moderate- and middle-income households
Moderate- and middle-income households, 76% of which are non-white, have been increasingly burdened by expensive housing costs in the past two decades. Public funding and private market incentives play a role in making housing more accessible for these families but building subsidized units for this income level is more costly because State and Federal funding cannot be leveraged.

Draft 1 of the Housing element includes recommendations for publicly funded housing and privately built housing to serve moderate- and middle-income households.

Recommendations for subsidized housing include:
- Pursuing educator and first responder housing program and expanding it to include transit operators and hospital workers.
• Seek non-City financing methods to supplement local public funds.
• Target down payment assistant programs to areas with higher concentration of communities of color.

**Recommendations for privately funded housing include:**
• Reducing cost of construction through streamlined review: this means the City would shorten review and permitting process if the buildings:
  • Are smaller scale 4-8 story buildings that fit the scale of most neighborhoods.
  • Serve moderate- and middle-income households.
  • Are in neighborhoods with fewer new units built in the past two decades.

**Potential focus group questions:**
• **Subsidized housing for moderate- and middle-income households:** How should the City invest public funding to support housing for moderate- and middle-income families and individuals?
• **Privately funded housing for moderate- and middle-income households:** A streamlined approval process for privately funded housing would not provide neighbors an opportunity to review individual housing projects. Instead, they would provide input in planning processes and guiding requirement for housing projects in general. Do you think a streamlined project approval process is a helpful approach to ensure privately built housing serves moderate and middle-income households?

**2d- Continued engagement**

**Potential focus group questions:**
• **What would be the best way to approach community engagement for new housing in your community? What has or hasn’t worked in the past?**
APPENDIX C.
Focus Group Community Partner Selection Criteria

The Project Team has designed focus groups to engage stakeholders in the review of the first draft of Housing Element goals, policies, and actions and gather feedback answering the question: “How do you think these policies and actions would get to what you need?” The team seeks alignment between the draft policies, the housing needs of our residents, and the equity goals and strategies of our partner organizations.

Approach:

- Collaborate with key CBOs leaders to implement approximately 25 focus groups of 8-10 participants, organized roughly by neighborhood geography, cultural affiliation, or targeted vulnerabilities. The maximum duration of focus groups will be 2 hours, including 30 minutes of preparation.
- Compensate community partners for assisting with focus group implementation and provide incentives to focus group participants.
- Work collaboratively with CBO partners to tailor messaging for each focus group to be culturally responsive and specific to the ideas and needs of their community.

Community Partner Selection Process

OUTREACH AND RECRUITMENT
The project team employed several methods to invite community partners into the focus group implementation process.

Email Blasts
On April 9, 2021 the project team sent group emails announcing the first draft of the Housing Element and requesting focus group partners. The message was sent to all participants of Phase I of community engagement and all members of the public who have signed up for Housing Element information. This was followed by two more email blasts inviting the public to engage in our outreach process.

Email Recipients
- Housing Policy Group members (49 organizations)
- Subscribers to Housing Element website (1,328 contacts)
- Community Organization Contact List from Phase I Outreach (572 contacts)

SEEKING RECOMMENDATIONS
In April, the project team began seeking recommendations for community partners from several advisory bodies.

Planning Commission
On April 22, 2021, staff presented a project update to the Planning Commission and announced the partnership model for the focus groups, inviting attendees to contact the project team for more information.

Human Rights Commission
In April 2021, SF Planning began consulting with the Human Rights Commission (HRC) about focus group partner selection. SF Planning attended several HRC-hosted Roundtable meetings and a hearing, including on April 16, 2021, to ask for interested partners or recommended partners.

Community Equity Advisory Council
In June 2021, the project team began consulting with the newly formed Community Equity Advisory Council about the engagement strategy seeking recommendations for key community partners.
TARGETED INVITES
Starting in April and continuing through July, the project team began making individual requests to partner with key community groups. Individual requests focused on potential community partners who could reach demographic groups not formerly engaged in the Housing Element outreach, groups especially vulnerable to housing instability, or difficult to reach groups (i.e. the unhoused or marginally housed, residents who primarily speak a language other than English, very low income residents, transitional aged youth, and others). These targeted invites were guided by senior staff, community engagement specialists within SF Planning, key partner agencies, and community organizations currently engaged in Housing Element outreach.

- Community leaders in neighborhood or on key topics
- Coalitions
- Cultural District organizations
- Housing Policy Group members

Selection
Criteria
The sub-consultant, incommon, in consultation with the SF Planning project team, used the following criteria to identify potential community partners for the focus groups.

- Directly serving the targeted community
- Priority to service providers than advocacy organizations
- Cultural competency and in language staff
- Experience with housing policy was not required as this process is also a pilot for capacity building, but general understanding of housing needs

The selection process was limited by the project schedule and budget; therefore, partner identification is expected to end in July to allow the team to complete focus group events by the end of August.

Confirmation
SF Planning sought to confirm all interested focus group community partners in order to reach maximum diversity in the range of participants. This led to confirming approximately 20 community partners who expressed interest and capacity to convene and/or co-host and/or co-facilitate a focus group. This exceeded the originally scoped 15 partners but ensured a more diverse range of participants.

Selected partners were invited to document the roles of all parties (community organization, SF Planning, SF Planning’s consultant) in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU included details about partner compensation and participant incentives.
APPENDIX D.
Housing Policy Group Summary

Stakeholder Feedback Summary

In August of 2021 the Planning Department reconvened the Housing Policy Group (HPG) to discuss key topics related to the draft housing element. We held 5 feedback sessions each focused on a different topic. We selected topics where we felt that the draft needed the most help and asked participants to review and discuss a subset of the draft Policies and Actions under each topic area. We invited specific representatives to each discussion based on their organization's expertise, and their prior participation in previous rounds of HPG discussions. We also shared the list of topics with everyone who had participated actively in prior HPG meetings and asked if they were interested in participating in any of the discussions. We also actively sought participation from other organizations, not previously part of HPG, if certain topics needed a wider set of expertise.

For each session we provided a list of selected actions relevant to the topic for participants to review prior to the session. These lists are attached below. In addition to general feedback and thoughts, we asked each group to:

1) Identify actions that are essential to keep in the draft as it is revised,
2) to discuss issues or ideas that seem to be missing or could be added to the draft to better achieve the overall goal, and
3) to identify 1-3 actions that should be seen as top priorities.

These sessions helped the department to prioritize and refine the actions in the draft housing element. We received many suggestions for additional actions and some feedback on actions that could be removed or combined.

Participating Organizations
There were 7 meetings total with 27 participating organizations.

attended multiple meetings
Habitat for Humanity*
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Bayview Hunters Point Community
Advocates/Southeast Community Council
California Consortium of Urban Indian Health
Homeownership SF
Japantown Cultural District
Japantown Taskforce
Livable City
San Francisco Apartment Association
San Francisco Electrical Construction Industry*
San Francisco Housing Action Coalition
Senior Disability Action
SPUR
Wah Mei School*
YIMBY Action
YIMBY Law

attended 1 meeting
African American Reparations Advisory Committee*
African American Arts and Cultural District*
American Indian Cultural District
Good Jobs First*
HRC/Dream Keeper Initiative*
Midpen Housing*
Open Door Legal
Richmond Neighborhood Center*
San Francisco Foundation
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation
The John Stewart Company*

*Participated for the first time in Phase 2
Key Takeaways:

A number of concrete suggestions for changes or additions to the draft housing element emerged from these discussions. Some suggestions were raised multiple times over multiple sessions. Among the top suggestions were:

- Identify specific sources of funding for more of the proposed actions
- Refine and standardize the language used to refer to vulnerable populations
- Initiate a discussion about the feasibility of offering affordable housing preferences to members of racially defined communities that have been discriminated against in the past
- Consider adding an action to fund community-based support to help targeted households apply for affordable housing
- Strengthen the actions related to tenant protections and address tenant buyouts as well as evictions.
- Strengthen the actions related to promoting homeownership – particularly as a wealth building tool and as a tool for affordable infill in lower density neighborhoods.
- Add actions related to supporting development of affordable homeownership units particularly on smaller lots which might not be suitable for rental housing
- Add actions to expand support for Shared Equity Homeownership
- Recommit to providing housing balance and jobs-housing fit data publicly on an annual basis
- If the Housing Element calls for community benefits in exchange for streamlining, identify either the specific benefits or the process for selecting them in the document rather than simply saying that there should be a connection.
- Add an action committing to redesign the Former RDA Certificates of Preference program to better meet the needs of Certificate holders and their descendants.
- Spell out more clearly how the City will capture land value from anticipated upzonings to ensure benefits for the whole community
- Add an action related to providing support, removing permitting barriers and ‘hand holding’ for homeowners in priority geographies who want to perform home repairs
- Clarify the language in III.5.c about limiting zoning changes to those that benefit communities of color – provide a clearer framework for how this would work and who would decide.
- Add an action committing to examine the building code to ensure that it facilitates the use of Cross Laminated Timber construction
- Where the draft refers to ‘streamlining’ be clearer about what specific changes are anticipated and consider including fixed approval timelines
- Add an action related to developing objective standards clarifying when demolitions are appropriate and change rules to make demolition easier in those cases, in order to expand the opportunities for infill development in lower density locations.
- Refine all actions that talk about affordable units to ensure that it is always clear when the document is referring to deed restricted units vs. Units that are inexpensive without formal restrictions. Clarify which incentives/streamlining changes proposed in the draft would be accompanied by affordability restrictions.
- Add an action calling for updating the HOME-SF program to make it more attractive to developers
- Add an action related to supporting lower-income homeowners in redeveloping their own properties to add more units and generate income
- Consider adopting standard pre-approved designs for duplex, triplex and four-plex buildings which could be approved without any discretionary review.
- Develop a system for identifying a small subset of ‘priority’ actions (either for the whole Housing Element)
- Consider creating an ongoing process to update specific communities about progress on priorities selected by that community (ie. Newsletters/fact sheets, annual town hall type meetings, etc.)
- Consider adding an action to ‘codifying’ the cultural districts or otherwise strengthening their ability to manage change in their neighborhoods

A. Repairing Past Harms

Participants discussed the actions in the Draft Housing Element which are intended to directly respond to past racial discrimination in the housing element and begin the process of repairing the harms from these actions.

What to Keep
Several participants voiced support for the draft’s overall effort to “acknowledge, repair and empower” communities that experienced past harms. One participant said, “for a city to say this explicitly creates a great platform to grow on.” Participants particularly mentioned liking the goals focused on bringing back displaced populations and providing additional resources for community based organizations. People generally liked the framing about repair and reparations but there was some concern about whether the City could live up to the language here. One person said, “I would anticipate a reaction that this is just more rhetoric.” In general, the suggestion was to keep the language in the draft but add more specificity about accountability and to identify the funding necessary to implement more of the actions. One participant said “not having resources means shifting the burden to the community.”

There was a discussion about the terms such as “American Indian, Black and other people of color” which the draft uses to refer to groups that are targeted for support. One suggestion was to use a standard term throughout but to include a section of the document that more clearly defines who is included.

What’s Missing:
Several people expressed concern that the intention to bring displaced people back to the city was still too vague to be effective. More than one participant called for preferences by race for affordable housing units. Others called for offering opportunities first to people who have been displaced and want to return. One asked for new resources to train community members to fill out housing applications to register for lotteries. Several suggested additional ways that the city could invest in engaging communities. Some participants asked for more consistency from the city on racial equity noting that they have to deal with multiple city departments which each have different approaches. Another added that “it seems inconsistent for planning to hold this position pushing for repairing harms while other departments seem to be working for the opposite.”

There was widespread concern about how communities would hold the City to implementing these actions. There was also concern about how communities could track all of the different actions. One
suggestion was to pick 4 top priorities each year and share results with the community rather than bringing everything and overwhelming people.

**Top Priorities:**
Most participants mentioned concerns about accountability as their top priority in this area. Some asked that the Department “sharpen the language about accountability” while others suggested more attention to implementation strategies or metrics of success. One participant suggested that the City provide customized newsletters for each district outlining key outcomes from the Housing Element relevant to the priorities of that community. Another suggested that the City host monthly round tables in each community to report on priority actions.

**B. Building Housing in High Opportunity Areas**
Participants discussed a set of proposed actions in the draft element which aim to expand the supply of housing and of affordable housing in “high opportunity” parts of the city.

**What to Keep**
There was enthusiasm about the goal of building 50% of new housing in High Opportunity Areas. Most participants were also enthusiastic about the goal of prioritizing 50% of affordable housing funding for these areas but there were some concerns about the practicality of that goal. Existing actions related to tenant protections and land banking were also popular.

**What’s Missing:**
Nearly all participants agreed that the draft needed to say more about strategies for community education and outreach in order to be successful in achieving the ambitious goals for High Opportunity Areas. The strategy of funding CBOs to lead community education was suggested by several participants with some stressing that there needed to be funding for CBS to “staff up.” Several participants noted the need for more actions related to tenant protections. Affordable homeownership development was also suggested as a strategy for promoting community acceptance in High Opportunity Areas. Some participants argued that the City should require family sized units in new buildings, particularly in areas where density limits might cause developers to build only very small units. Others felt that requiring larger market rate units would make housing less affordable without necessarily serving families in need. There was some disagreement about the desirability of identifying community benefits in exchange for streamlining. Some felt that this was a good way to build support for more density, while others were concerned about that the cost of benefits could make the needed housing infeasible.

**Top Priorities:**
Multiple participants identified capacity building for community based organizations and construction of permanently affordable units as critical priorities. In addition, up-zoning ambitiously, community education and engagement and expanded case management were identified as priorities by some participants.

**C. Building Housing in Priority Geographies**
Participants discussed the Draft Housing Element Actions that aim to support and strengthen neighborhoods identified as being most at risk for further displacement.
What to Keep
Many participants appreciated the draft’s goal of ensuring geographic equity in where new housing is built. In particular, participants mentioned wanting to preserve the actions related to promoting community ownership of land, expanded neighborhood preferences, implementing a Right to Return policy, expanding homeownership production and prioritizing homelessness prevention investments in Priority Geographies.

What’s Missing:
There was a discussion about homeownership programs and how to target resources to expand homeownership. Participants discussed how homeownership projects could be built on lots that might be too small for typical rental buildings. Participants also expressed interest in easier to use programs to help homeowners fund and manage repairs – possibly staffed by local nonprofit organizations because “nobody’s grandmother wants to hire a contractor and supervise them.” Another participant suggested a need for streamlined building permit process for residents of Priority Geographies in order to make it easier for homeowners in these neighborhoods to make repairs.

There was also a discussion of preferences and the Certificates of Preference issued by the former Redevelopment Agency to residents that were displaced. Participants expressed concern about the difficulty residents have had using the Certificates and suggested that the housing resources available in the City do not well match the needs of the Certificate holders.

Participants also suggested that the draft needs to say more about Environmental Justice and what it means for communities and to spell out more clearly how we will recapture the land value created by zoning changes and ensure that that value goes to the community.

Top Priorities:
Priority actions mentioned included, expanding homeownership production by building on smaller lots, targeting homelessness resources to Priority Geographies, ensuring that new buildings are spread across the city more equitably, and promoting community ownership of land and land acquisition strategies

D. Small and Medium Sized Buildings
Participants discussed strategies for expanding the supply of small and medium sized buildings throughout the city.

What to Keep
Most participants supported the idea integrating streamlining and community benefits into packaged deals. One participant summarized the discussion by saying “The challenge of getting things approved becomes leverage. We are talking about getting rid of all of that leverage. But then you have to make sure that every streamlining is accompanied by community benefits including strong labor agreements.” And another agreed “When there are things we all agree are benefits, exchanging them for streamlining makes sense.”
What's Missing:
Someone suggested that streamlining should be accompanied by a fixed approval timeline “if we are serious.” Another participant suggested that the document was missing actions that would make it easier to demolish existing buildings which could be key. But because demolitions will raise community concerns, someone else suggested adopting objective standards for what kind of demolition is acceptable and another participant suggested that demolition could be limited to owner occupied homes in order to protect renters.

Participants also discussed the potential geographic distribution of future small multi-family buildings. Some participants were concerned with impacts on tenants and one suggested only offering streamlining for these buildings in neighborhoods where 2/3 of the homes are owner occupied.

There was disagreement about the potential for modular construction to facilitate the construction of small multi-family buildings. San Francisco unions have opposed modular unless it is built to city (not state) standards. However there is no labor opposition to adoption of Cross Laminated Timber technology which also promises to lower construction costs.

Someone suggested that it would be ideal if the city had standard duplex and 4-plex building designs which could be approved without any discretionary approval process. Several others expressed support for this idea because it might reduce the risk for small property owners.

Top Priorities:
Top priorities for participants included ensuring that developers of small buildings were local/people of color, ensuring that these buildings are financially feasible, and focusing on larger, higher density projects along transit corridors.

E. Middle Income Housing
Participants discussed potential actions to expand the supply of housing affordable to middle and moderate income households.

What to Keep
In general, people liked that the draft included a mix of subsidized and unsubsidized strategies for serving middle income households. People mostly supported the notion that it was appropriate for the City to provide subsidy for permanently income restricted middle income units and also to adopt policies that support market provision of unrestricted units serving this income group. Participants called for preserving the draft’s emphasis on using public land for affordable housing, streamlining development of middle income housing, facilitating small multi-family buildings in lower density areas, encouraging employers to build industry specific housing, and encouraging employers to contribute to homeownership programs. Several participants expressed support for streamlining approval of Accessory Dwelling Units and expanding that to other building types as well.

What’s Missing:
One participant pointed out that eliminating parking requirements could help make more middle income housing financially possible. Others asked that the actions more strongly encourage shared equity homeownership (CLTs, deed restrictions) that allow wealth building but preserve affordability for future buyers.

Participants suggested that the draft could be clearer about which incentives would come with affordability restrictions. Some of the actions mention restrictions and others don’t and it was not clear to everyone whether that was intentional. In particular, there was a disagreement about whether deed restrictions should be required in exchange for permit streamlining for small multi-family buildings. Some people argued that ‘the housing is the benefit’ while others argued that including affordable units was necessary to ensure that the public benefits from changes like this. Others called for close financial feasibility analysis to ensure that any requirements don’t make these projects infeasible. Someone pointed out that the goal with allowing more small-multi family buildings would be to create more abundant housing citywide which could lower prices but not necessarily ensure that each individual project would be affordable and another participant suggested that we could test that idea for a period of time and if buildings were generally providing middle income units we scale it up and if not, we could shut it down.

One suggestion for encouraging more small multi-family would be to eliminate the need for a Conditional Use permit when a homeowner demolishes their single family home to build a new building.

Some participants felt that calling out educator housing was not appropriate because there are so many other people who need and deserve help.

**Top Priorities:**
Top priorities mentioned by participants included facilitating development of small multi-family buildings, streamlining ADUs, using public land for mixed-income affordable housing development and allowing group homes as a principally permitted use.

**F. Accountability**
Participants discussed potential strategies for holding City government accountable to community priorities and ensuring implementation of the Housing Element’s ambitious racial and social equity goals after the plan is adopted.

**What Does Accountability Mean?**
Participants were asked how they would define accountability and who they thought the Housing Element should be maintaining accountability to. Some participants articulated a fairly narrow view of accountability which involved simply identifying who was responsible for implementing each action so that stakeholders would know where to turn if actions were not being implemented. Others focused on transparency calling for development of metrics that would indicate whether the actions were having the intended effect. But a number of participants equated accountability with power sharing.
These participants pointed out that creating accountability to communities that have been harmed by past planning processes requires changing power dynamics and many expressed real concern about whether the City was ready to do that. One participant said “100% it’s power, and the housing element will be a bust if those who have it now don’t share it.” Another added “We have felt that this [Housing Element] process is a breath of fresh air but we don’t trust that your bosses will let you implement it.” Several participants expressed a sense that accountability would require “delegating” decision making or budgeting power to ‘communities themselves” while others seemed to feel like it would be possible for the department to craft more of a partnership with communities. One said “It has to be shared, not completely given over in all areas. It is about saying we are not holding all the card but we have equal parts of the deck.”

**What to Keep**
In general participants liked that the draft Housing Element recognized the need to partner with communities and to engage people in ongoing implementation but many felt that the specific actions identified were not concrete or specific enough.

There was some discussion of what kind of accountability would be most helpful. One participant observed “in America the only real way to make people do what they don’t want to do is to sue them.” Several others responded that there were better ways to hold the City accountable. One suggested “The Housing Element is a policy document. If we take it at an aspirational level - there are more values based statements here than in past housing elements. We can use politics as a tool.”

**What’s Missing:**
There was general agreement that it would be helpful for City staff to ‘convene with the community’ at intervals to help people understand what progress was being made on Housing Element goals. Several participants praised the outreach and engagement that has accompanied the Housing Element update and suggested that a similar level of effort may be necessary in the future on an ongoing basis. But other participants were concerned about increasing the number of meetings that community members were expected to attend. One participant said “For American Indians - if we had a town hall - people love to eat, we need space to talk but people would want to know what the goal is. It could be harmful to engage people too much without showing action.” Another participant added “We lose engagement once people feel like they are not heard.”

Someone suggested that the department publish individualized fact sheets about what progress was made in specific communities. While there was broad support for the idea of individualized reporting to targeted communities, there were different perspectives about what the right forum would be for the City to engage communities. Someone suggested that the department could use Cultural Districts to identify priorities and regularly report on progress. Others were concerned that Cultural Districts didn’t reach all the relevant communities. Someone else suggested returning to neighborhood planning so that every area could have a locally developed plan.
## Detailed Feedback

### A. Repairing Past Harm

**Housing Policy Group Discussion: July 29, 2021**

### Relevant Draft Goals, Policies and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GOAL 2: Repair the harms of historic racial, ethnic, social discrimination for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Reframe the narrative of housing challenges to acknowledge and understand the discrimination against Communities of Color as a root cause for disparate outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Acknowledge and identify the historic discriminatory programs and policies, and their disparate impacts on American Indian, Black, and other People of Color as part of Phase 2 of the San Francisco Planning Department’s Racial Equity Action Plan, building upon the Planning Commission’s and the Historic Preservation Commission’s resolutions that center planning on racial and social equity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Support the completion and implementation of Racial Equity Action Plans for all City agencies relevant to the provision of housing and housing services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standardize a list of indicators that measure housing needs and challenges for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color to incorporate into any analysis supporting community planning processes or proposed housing policy or legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Embrace the guidance of community leaders representing American Indian, Black, and other People of Color throughout the planning and implementation of housing solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Ensure elevated representation of American Indian, Black, and other Communities of Color in decision making bodies such as Community Advisory Councils (CACs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Increase Planning Department resources and staff allocation to build capacity and partnerships with Community-based organizations that primarily serve and represent American Indian, Black, other People of Color across all department functions, including long-range planning, program implementation, and regulatory review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Increase grant funding sources and staff allocation within MOHCD, OEWD, DPW, ARTS, and Planning to create a more robust, sustained, and effective Cultural Districts program and support their respective Cultural History Housing and Economic Sustainability Strategies (CHHESS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Identify and implement priority strategies recommended by advisory bodies primarily serving and representing American Indian, Black, and other People of Color such as the African American Reparations Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amplify and prioritize voices of American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in the City’s engagement processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Fund and coordinate with community-based organizations primarily serving and representing American Indian, Black, other People of Color for inclusive outreach and engagement and meaningful participation in planning processes related to housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Engage and gather input from underserved and underrepresented communities in the early stages of neighborhood and community planning processes and housing policy development through focus groups, surveys, and during community engagement events through funded partnerships with community-based organizations that primarily serve and represent People of Color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Implement culturally competent outreach relevant to various groups such as youth, seniors, various ethnicities, and cultures, including materials in various languages, simple language, and trauma-informed communications for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color, and low-income populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Share best practices with private developers for meaningful, robust, and culturally competent outreach and engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### II.3 e
Update requirements for project sponsors for certain development projects, such as those subject to Preliminary Project Assessment process, to engage with interested Cultural Districts and other community-based organizations that serve Vulnerable Groups located in proximity to the project; such engagement should occur in a timely manner that allows these communities to shape the project prior to formal application submittals.

### II.4
Measure racial and social equity in each step of the planning process for housing to assess and pursue ways to achieve beneficial outcomes for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color.

#### II.4 a
Develop and align department-wide metrics to evaluate progress on housing policies advancing racial equity based on and consistent with the San Francisco Equity Index prepared by the Office of Racial Equity.

#### II.4 b
Assess and implement resources in the City’s housing work program areas and investments that proactively advance racial and social equity.

#### II.4 c
Develop and implement an impact analysis approach that seeks to identify racial, social, and health inequities related to plans or development projects of certain scope or scale and identify mitigation measures or alternative strategies.

### II.5
Bring back People of Color displaced from the city by strengthening racial and cultural anchors and increasing housing opportunities in support of building wealth.

#### II.5 a
Implement the right to return legislation for residents of public housing and explore expanding right to return opportunities previously displaced.

#### II.5 b
Continue efforts to offer affordable homeownership opportunities to communities displaced by past discriminatory government programs. Such government programs include the Redevelopment and Urban Renewal or the Indian Relocation Act.

#### II.5 d
Identify, preserve, and expand cultural and community assets and anchors (arts, historic buildings/sites, cultural events, and cultural institutions) for American Indian and Black communities through community-led processes such as the American Indian Cultural District, the African American Arts and Culture Districts’ Cultural History Housing and Economic Sustainability Strategies (CHHESS), or historic context statements.

#### II.5 e
Identify opportunities to dedicate land to the American Indian Community to redress the historic dispossession of resources affecting these communities, Indian Relocation Act, or other historic efforts that broke the cohesion of this community.

### II.6
Prioritize health improvement investments within Environmental Justice Communities to ensure that housing reduces existing health disparities.

#### II.6 a
Identify the public health needs of neighborhoods through community planning processes or large-scale development projects by engaging community-based organizations, and San Francisco Public Health Department, and other City agencies; public health needs include addressing air, soil, and noise pollution, sea level rise vulnerability, access to parks, open spaces, healthy food, and community safety.

#### II.6 b
Expand funding for acquisition and rehabilitation programs to remove mold and other health hazards.

#### II.6 c
When building housing on environmentally contaminated sites located in Environmental Justice Communities and Priority Geographies, require developers to conduct culturally competent outreach in adjacent communities to inform them about remediation processes and ensure stronger accountability and oversight.

### III.1
Eliminate community displacement of American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in Priority Geographies.

#### III.1 a
Dedicate a minimum budget for permanently affordable housing in Priority Geographies within the 10-year Capital Planning to support funding for planned affordable housing in these areas and with a goal of 50% of RHNA permanently affordable housing targets within the next two cycles (by 2038) in Priority Geographies.

#### III.1 b
Develop and implement community-developed strategies in Cultural Districts to retain and grow culturally associated businesses and services that attract residents back to the area.

#### III.1 d
Support the development of businesses owned by American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in affordable housing buildings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III.1 e</th>
<th>Continue and expand efforts to target education and housing readiness counseling programs, including in-language trainings, to support the neighborhood preference program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.1 f</td>
<td>Explore increasing neighborhood preference allocation for Below Market Rate units in Priority Geographies if possible per the Federal Fair Housing regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2</td>
<td>Expand investments in Priority Geographies to advance equitable access to resources while ensuring community stability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2 a</td>
<td>Develop equity metrics and criteria to identify the necessary infrastructure improvements to guide all investment decisions made through a variety of policies and procedures including: Capital Planning, General Plan Elements, Interagency Plan Implementation Committee or Citizen Advisory Council review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2 b</td>
<td>Prioritize Priority Geographies in investments to improve transit service, as well as other community infrastructure improvements to parks, streetscape, and neighborhood amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2 c</td>
<td>Increase funding for community-based organizations serving American Indian, Black, and other People of Color, and Priority Geographies for anti-displacement services, such as legal services, code enforcement outreach, tenant counseling, mediation, and housing-related financial assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2 d</td>
<td>Support and expand indigenous community leadership navigation of services and systems to provide tenants’ rights education, similar to the existing Code Enforcement Outreach Program that is offered within the Department of Building Inspection; consider expanding this culturally competent program to other People of Color (American Indian, Black, and other People of Color).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4 a</td>
<td>Target increased investment in the Downpayment Assistance Loan Program to households who live in Priority Geographies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4 b</td>
<td>Increase targeted outreach and financial readiness education including in-language trainings to American Indian, Black, and People of Color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4 c</td>
<td>Create new homeownership programs to enable the Black community to grow and thrive by maintaining and expanding their property ownership including mixed-use buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Notes:**

**Which actions are most important to keep:**

Participants identified a number of actions to preserve including:

- There was support for the idea of ongoing focus groups or other outreach efforts with compensation to CBOs/participants. One participant said “There are also a lot of orgs that represent the African American community, so we need a coordinator from Planning to make sure that those conversations, collaborations are fruitful. This is going to take money – we’re asking folks to dedicate their time, so we need to make sure there’s some sort of incentive for folks to participate”
- There was support for the idea of “right to return.” One participant asked “How do we make these housing opportunities available first to the people who want to return?” Another said “Our priority is right to return, being able to rent or own a home, and having community-serving facilitates. We want a multigenerational housing opportunity for everyone.”
- There was support for maintaining a minimum budget for support of Permanently Affordable Housing in Priority Geographies (III.1.a)
- There was a lot of support for retaining the language around repairing past harms.
  - “Reparations is a trigger word for a lot of people – but you have to keep that language. Reparations framework is necessary to actually repair harm.”
What’s Missing:

Participants also identified a number of things to add or change about the current draft:

- One participant suggested investing in “teaching folks how to navigate and apply for affordable housing.”
- There were several suggestions about how to more effectively engage with vulnerable communities during implementation of the housing element:
  - Instead of burdening communities to do this, I would love to see a list of community organizations and have Planning to come out once a month to host a roundtable with our communities. Do not want a giant “BIPOC” meeting. How do we put the burden back on planning so that we’re not doing all the work again.
  - I want a cheat sheet of the metrics of housing production and demographics so that we can have knowledge disseminated to the community.
  - I want metrics on specific priorities, especially across departments. That way communities can be better engaged and be up-to-date.
  - Publish the findings in a newsletter for each area you have completed. Make the process for each one of these objectives transparent and publish the intended implementation strategies. Simplify the materials and objectives that are sent to the orgs/districts/ and public. These are info heavy, target the main objectives you want to get from folks or the main info at a given point in time rather than an info dump of the whole plan.
- Several participants pointed to the need for closer coordination with other city departments to ensure that the City is fully committed to these goals:
  - Planning sits in the City bureaucracy, and it ends up being hypocritical when you talk about these huge ideals while other departments in the city are not pursuing these goals at all. It’s not fair to the community, and not to Planning staff.
  - It’s unfair to [Planning Staff] when the bureaucracy behind you is continuing to do harm... The city needs to fully own the acknowledgement of past harms. I’ve seen it by some departments but not the city as a whole.
  - How are the different departments’ social equity plans being weaved together? What was helpful was seeing Planning use the same metrics/maps at Public Health. Without synchronization, community orgs have to do the work of coordination with all these different departments that each have their own metrics of equity.
- Several participants suggested replacing the current affordable housing lotteries with a system that would be more directly race-based.
  - Get rid of the lottery. It’s structurally inequitable if your goal is to get back American Indian, Black, Japanese Americans, POC. Statistically, Black people make up 3% of SF, so how are we going to bring them back on a lottery with equal chances?
  - The Japanese American story is full of government-imposed actions that forced us out of our communities. If we’re just talking about housing in San Francisco, it’s important to me that we’re acknowledged and our specific experience. What does the return of the certificate of preference mean? Those original families are long gone, how are you going to meaningfully implement COP now? I don’t feel that the harm that Japanese Americans have experienced have been sufficiently acknowledged.
Someone suggested not relying on loans for homebuyer assistance: “We need more free money, like for home repair/maintenance. It just ends up being loans, which are not really supportive long-term.”

Several participants urged the department not to try to do all of this at once and to instead think about prioritizing. One said: “Sequencing is key. It would be helpful to see how you plan to sequence these efforts”

There was also much agreement that the Housing Element needed to be more specific and concrete if it was going to succeed in such ambitious goals.

- We need capital and actual investment, and we should align contributions across the system.” The document needs to “sharpen language and accountability – how do we actually measure these plans?
- Section 3 starts to get fluffy. It doesn’t matter if the capital isn’t connected to it. What are the specific initiatives? What is the thing that actually gets money into the community? How do you get it beyond CBOs and to the community? Unless there’s money dedicated to a policy that you can be held accountable to, then this is the same as all the other rhetorical promises we’ve been given.
- We need greater specificity on intent. What does “bringing people back” mean? Name the things that are needed to help people stay.

Other issues that came up:

- There was some discussion of the language used to refer to different ethnic groups.
  - This policy has clearly outlined priorities for American Indian and Black communities, but Japanese Americans have been stuffed into this category of “people of color.” We’ve had specific community traumas – internment, redevelopment, eminent domain – and we want to be named specifically in policies.
  - I think the “BIPOC” issue is part of larger issue. This reminds me of the sudden interest in land acknowledgements – it came out of nowhere and all these cities are coming to us to pass these land acknowledgement resolutions without it organically coming from the community. It just feels like a PC resolution. I would encourage you to continue to check in with communities along the way to see how they’d like to be identified.
- Several participants expressed real appreciation for the progress to date and for the level of community engagement in this effort.
  - Kudos, that the Planning Department really listened and I want to recognize that.
  - This is a good platform to start from – let’s make this a floor rather than a ceiling.

Priorities:

- Right to return
- Affordable housing preferences by race
- Access to housing inventory
- Assistance to own or rent to live in the community
### B. Building Housing in High Opportunity Areas

**Housing Policy Group: August 24, 2021**

#### Relevant Draft Goals, Policies and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Establish a goal of building 50 percent of the regional housing targets at each income-level, increasing over the long-term, to be built in High Opportunity Neighborhoods within the next two RHNA cycles (by 2038) through zoning changes, streamlining approvals, and encouraging the use of state and local density programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase housing choice along Rapid bus and rail corridors and near major transit stops in High Opportunity Neighborhoods through zoning changes and streamlining approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Increase capacity for residential development through changes to height limits, removal of density controls, and other zoning changes to improve feasibility of multi-family buildings especially midrise buildings along SFMTA’s Rapid networks and major nodes such as Geary blvd., Judah Street, 19th Ave, Lombard Street, Ocean Ave, Taravel Street, West Portal Ave, and Van Ness Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Identify community benefits that would allow streamlined approval of midrise multi-family buildings within High Opportunity Areas, such as units serving middle-income households, inclusionary requirements, land dedication for permanently affordable housing, or ground floor space for neighborhood serving community facilities or businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Explore the possibility of high-rise towers at major transit nodes along Rapid bus and rail corridors within High Opportunity Neighborhood parallel with needed infrastructure improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase housing choice by allowing and facilitating small multi-family buildings in low-density areas within High Opportunity Neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Transition to using building form and scale (e.g. Height and bulk requirements) and unit minimums to regulate development instead of lot-based unit maximums in low-density zoned residential districts in High Opportunity Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Identify community benefits that would allow streamlined approval of small multi-family buildings within High Opportunity Areas, such as units serving middle-income households, affordable housing fees, or ground floor space for neighborhood serving community facilities or businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enable low and moderate-income households particularly American Indian, Black, and other People of Color to live and prosper in High Opportunity Neighborhoods through increasing units that are permanently affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Increase housing affordable to extremely and very low-income households in High Opportunity Areas through City funded permanently affordable housing projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Create a funded land banking program to purchase sites that could accommodate at least 50 units on each site in High Opportunity neighborhoods, such as church sites and partnership with interfaith council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Establish a goal of dedicating 50 percent of the City’s permanently affordable housing budget within 10-year capital planning cycles for High Opportunity Neighborhoods while dedicating a minimum budget to support funding for planned affordable housing in Priority Geographies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Create and expand funding for programs that offer case management, financial literacy education, and housing readiness to low-income American Indian, Black and other People of Color households who seek housing choices in High Opportunity Areas, along with providing incentives and counseling to landlords to offer their unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Pursue zoning changes to increase development capacity that accommodates equitable distribution of growth throughout the city particularly in High Opportunity Neighborhoods and new Priority Development Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>Prioritize Planning Department staff resources on review of Discretionary Review applications that contain tenant protection issues and those within Priority Geographies over applications in High Opportunity Neighborhoods that do not involve tenant considerations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V.4   c   Transition to using building form and scale (e.g. Height and bulk requirements) and unit minimums to regulate development instead of lot-based unit maximums in the low-density zoned residential districts in High Opportunity Neighborhoods.

V.4   d   Identify certain community benefits that would allow streamlined approval of small multi-family buildings in High Opportunity Areas such as units serving middle-income households, affordable housing fees, or ground floor space for neighborhood serving community facilities or businesses.

VI.2   b   Establish a goal of building 50 percent of the regional housing targets at each income-level to be built in High Opportunity Neighborhoods within the next two Regional Housing Needs Allocation cycles (by 2038) through zoning changes, streamlining approvals, and encouraging the use of state and local density programs.

VI.2   c   Plan for and dedicate funding to transportation infrastructure improvement to support areas slated for increased housing choice.

Discussion Notes:

Which actions are most important to keep:

Participants identified a number of actions to preserve including:
- Expanding housing opportunities for communities of color (III.8)
- Goal of meeting 50% of RHNA goals in High Opportunity Areas (III.5.a)
  - Its a great target to have in the Housing Element
  - I like the idea of aligning development with affordability; I wonder what else would be needed in order to truly make that happen
  - I’m very excited about the idea of putting housing in the Westside
  - Concern: it’s really hard to find the right sites in the first place, if we push to high resource and if we exclude sensitive communities, it will remove feasibility, we have to ask if maintaining the status quo helps people with evictions/displacement, protecting buildings that are heavily tenant occupied should be the goal.
  - Concern: I Like the metric of 50%, but it could take two RHNA cycles. Could be higher given how inequitable it has been.”
- Prioritizing tenant protections (IV.3.1)
  - I like trying to limit DR on tenant situations and prioritizing staff to things that matter
- Funding more case management (III.8.f)
- Land Banking (III.8.b)
  - Having a base of municipally owned land is going to be pretty critical for getting to 50% of housing in high opportunity areas
  - Requiring 50 units per parcel “feels very limited.” Habitat is building on a much smaller scale in Diamond Heights.
  - Also consider that Land trusts advance permanent affordability too
  - There was a question about whether MOHCD was on board with the idea of land banking
- Building on rail and bus corridors (III.6.c)
  - This is a really difficult nut to crack on the Westside
- Dedicating 50% of city funding for affordable housing to High Opportunity areas (III.8e)
  - I like this idea, but I would check with some of the affordable housing developers to make sure that this is realistic
  - The Housing Element cannot tell MOHCD to what to do. But we can make changes, high opportunity areas with the smaller sites, a site owned by the city that
only accommodated 80 units was too small for MOHCD which comes from state and the tax credit system, but it also comes from MOHCD because of cost efficiency, this leaves off high opportunity areas. It’s not about ‘should we go down from 100 to 50’ but it’s about how we go to 6 to 10 units.

- Identifying community benefits that would allow streamlining (III.7.b)
  - This supports smaller sizes and serving families that are middle income and setting some aside for permanently affordable; those things speak to me through the work we do with the people we serve
  - Concern also: would this result in housing that we want to see? About community benefits, we need to be careful there, if we want to encourage production of housing at all income levels in these areas, we don’t want to make it costly and complicated. I’d be cautious and think about the financial feasibility.

What’s missing:

- More tenant protections
  - This plan is 6-8 years. tenants out here getting evicted don’t have 6-8 years, tenant protections are important.
  - If we are thinking evictions we should think about the building typology, social issues and zoning don’t go well together. Are there secondary units that are being the target of evictions?
  - Evictions plus buyouts (looking at eviction cases will still miss a lot)

- More education/outreach
  - Lack of education about affordable housing people have different interpretation of affordable housing. Work with residents and merchants to improve understanding of what affordable housing mean.
  - We need to make sure that we are not missing certain things, they need to do outreach/funding.
  - I wonder if there are any efforts to fight over the opposition.
  - Educating a broader spectrum of folks of what these things mean. Where’s the place that could be addressed. We need to address that: invest in community organizations/schools to educate them on what this means to them.
  - Yes there needs to be funded outreach
  - Not just working with CBOs, but also funding them to staff up, the success that we’ve been seeing is where there’s funding to add capacity. That’s the change between two years ago in forest hill development and last month 2550 Irving where see the investment in CBOs paid off.

- Neighborhood specific strategies
  - Sea cliff/diamond heights, what could be an affordability strategy in those areas. Can things be done to enhance density and affordability?

- Family sized housing
  - Developers only go for minimums. We should require a percentage of bedroom mix. 50-60% family housing
  - Whenever we talk about getting rid of density limits, then you want to encourage family sized units
  - Family sized units even 4 bedrooms (8-10 person households), it’s a good fit for high opportunity areas.
• Concern: I would caution against family housing. My concern is not about the affordable side, larger units mean means more expensive units. If you are mandating bedroom counts, you are mandating larger units.

• Affordable Homeownership
  • Offering ownership helps with neighborhood opposition. Habitat is building eight 2-3 bedroom town homes in Diamond Heights. We have not encountered any opposition. Neighbors are helping build. Limited equity homeownership is a good fit for High Opportunity areas.

• Regional strategies
  • The regional view is missing, SF has a massive jobs/housing imbalance, we are exporting gentrification to the east bay by not housing our own workers, that’s not in the draft HE. We need to increase the ambition in terms of the number of homes you want to get built.

• Parking
  • We’re talking about increasing more housing, but we forget about parking, people are parking on the sidewalk. It’s great to have housing along the transit corridors but sometimes people have to drive to go to work.

• Analysis of Jobs/Housing Ballance
  • Around the conversation of jobs/housing: there was a budget analysis report two years ago. It was the first time the city did jobs housing fit. The planning department has not redone the report and that should inform the Housing Element. What are the jobs, what are the wages, and what are the housing that should be affordable to those wages.

Top ideas:
• Capacity-Building is key!
• Ambitious upzoning
• Building permanently affordable units
• Creating the conditions for support of these policies through education and existing community engagement opportunities
• Increase housing affordable to extremely and very low-income households in High Opportunity Areas through City funded permanently affordable housing projects. (but I would expand to low income as well)
• permanent affordability
• Eastside neighborhoods built housing not just because of big sites, former industrial, but because of organized communities of color demanding housing
• Expanded case management (III.8.f)
• Coordinating with MOHCD seems key for both building more units and funding capacity building

Other questions that arose:
• There was a question about whether the Planning Department had done an analysis of the amount of housing that could be accommodated in high opportunity areas through these strategies. Staff indicated that the Department’s Housing Affordability Strategies study developed detailed quantifiable scenarios.
• Someone asked for a definition of Land Banking: Land banking is the practice of local government aggregating parcels of land for future development, in particular of affordable housing
• There was a question about how “housing choice” is defined? Where is the data on what you are calling High Opportunities? Do the High Opportunity areas occupy 50% of the geography? How realistic is that? Does the map actually represent something realistic?
• There was a discussion of the High Opportunity and the Priority Geography Maps and how they compared with the Sensitive Communities map developed by the Urban Displacement Project.
• There was a question about how Acquisition and Rehabilitation contribute to the City’s RHNA goals. Staff clarified that these units count as 25% of a newly built unit if there are lasting income restrictions.

C. Strengthening and Stabilizing Priority Geographies
Housing Policy Group Discussion: August 2, 2021

Relevant Draft Goals, Policies and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Prioritize residents of Priority Geographies and Vulnerable Groups for placement in temporary shelters, and permanent supportive housing through the Coordinated Entry assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Prioritize homeless prevention investments, such as rental assistance, to people who live in Priority Geographies and are at risk of becoming unhoused including people with previous experiences of homelessness, living without a lease, families with young children, pregnant, formerly incarcerated, or with adverse childhood experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Target direct rental assistance to Vulnerable Groups and those who live in Priority Geographies, and areas with higher rates of displacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Pursue community ownership, co-housing, limited equity, stewardship, and land trust models, specifically within Priority Geographies and Cultural Districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminate community displacement of American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in Priority Geographies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Dedicate a minimum budget for permanently affordable housing in Priority Geographies within the 10-year Capital Planning to support funding for planned affordable housing in these areas and with a goal of 50% of RHNA permanently affordable housing targets within the next two cycles (by 2038) in Priority Geographies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Support non-profit developers of new permanently affordable housing developments in Priority Geographies through dedicated funding from GO BONDs or other eligible funding resources to include affordable neighborhood serving uses such as grocery stores, healthcare clinics, or institutional community uses such as child-care facilities, community facilities, job training centers, social services as part of their ground floor use programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Explore increasing neighborhood preference allocation for Below Market Rate units in Priority Geographies if possible per the Federal Fair Housing regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Increase housing affordable to extremely low and very low-income households in Priority Geographies through modifications in inclusionary requirement and prioritizing approval for development projects that serve these income groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Identify and support development of opportunity sites including publicly owned underutilized sites and large privately-owned sites to respond to both housing needs and community infrastructure especially within Priority Geographies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Prioritize Priority Geographies in investments to improve transit service, as well as other community infrastructure improvements to parks, streetscape, and neighborhood amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Increase funding for community-based organizations serving American Indian, Black, and other People of Color, and Priority Geographies for anti-displacement services, such as legal services, code enforcement outreach, tenant counseling, mediation, and housing-related financial assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Prioritize purchases for the acquisitions and rehabilitation program that serve extremely low income and unhoused populations (in Priority Geographies).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.4 Increase homeownership opportunities for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color especially within Priority Geographies to allow for wealth building and reversing historic inequities within these communities.

III.4 a Target increased investment in the Downpayment Assistance Loan Program to households who live in Priority Geographies.

III.4 b Increase targeted outreach and financial readiness education including in-language trainings to American Indian, Black, and People of Color.

III.4 c Create new homeownership programs to enable the Black community to grow and thrive by maintaining and expanding their property ownership including mixed-use buildings.

III.5 Ensure equitable geographic distribution of new multi-family housing throughout the city to reverse the impacts of exclusionary zoning practices and reduce the burden of concentrating new housing within Priority Geographies.

III.5 c Limit zoning changes within Priority Geographies to the specific needs of American Indian, Black, and other Communities of Color.

III.8 Establish a goal of dedicating 50 percent of the City’s permanently affordable housing budget within 10-year capital planning cycles for High Opportunity Neighborhoods while dedicating a minimum budget to support funding for planned affordable housing in Priority Geographies.

Discussion Notes:

What is important to keep?

Participants identified a number of actions to preserve including:

- Right to Return
  - Even with reparations being awarded, Japantown and Fillmore never recovered and continue to be redeveloped."

- Community ownership of land and Community Land Trusts (II.5a) is an important policy to ensure that the stewardship of land in Japantown is owned by Japanese and Japanese-American people. Retaining land is important to retain residents and businesses.

What’s Missing?

- Strengthen/update Certificates of Preference
  - We need to prioritize and honor certificates of preference... we are talking about great-grandkids who should have a right to these certificates
    - Program parameters are not aligned with the financial reality of the applicants, thus they do not qualify for the housing
    - We need to bring the programs in alignment with the income levels [of the COP holders.]
    - The DALP program targets higher income people and this is inherently exclusionary – People can’t use COP.

- Strengthen Neighborhood Preferences
  - [The way it works now, low income people] end up competing with each other; how do we invest in priority geographies while prioritizing neighborhood residents? when you target low-income housing here (Bayview), school teachers out-qualify neighbors; I would prefer to not be competing. Housing keeps going to people with a lot more advantages who should be lower in the priority list.

- Consider preferences by race
In item III.1, one of the tensions that I see is that Fair Housing law requires that any project is eligible to all people for those units; when you have Japanese American people competing, that makes it hard.

- Expand middle income housing
  - We've just accepted that we just cannot build housing for moderate income and middle-income residents. We need to say that 1) the market needs to produce housing for middle income people, PERIOD, if not we need to look to regulations.
  - We need to be centering the programs that we have for the people that need it most; we have taken low-income units away and people don't have other options

- Repair homes in Environmental Justice space, as we see a lot of regulatory demands being placed on residents, working with planning and air district around decarbonizing buildings, and particularly the technology is not there yet. And the cost of retrofitting and upgrading is prohibitive even for upper middle class, we need to have trusted people to do the work.

- We need clean up: soil has to be cleaned and the water needs to be monitored.

- Build more affordable homeownership units
  - We keep dumping money into the rental and we are not producing units to increase wealth. We keep thinking of just downpayment assistance, but it's NOT the only tool; we need to invest somewhere else.
  - Deed restricted ownership models can keep it homes affordable in perpetuity; let's put 20-25% [of city funding] into homeownership
  - We have been focusing just on rental when homeownership can really build wealth
  - [Instead of more downpayment assistance lets] create more units for which we CAN afford the downpayment.

- Another priority should be rehab or repair and increasing the opportunity for those funds; it's not realistic for people to go to the city and apply for the funds, find a contractor and manage everything.
  - No one's 85 year old grandma wants to go hire a contractor.
  - We need trusted people to do the retrofit work (habitat and rebuilding together)
  - How can we support rehab with trusting partners that will not price-gauge residents
  - Too many people get swindled with contractors; that is why we have Rebuilding Together and Habitat to talk to applicants

- The building inspection process and approval of upgrades definitely needs to be streamlined for our communities
  - DBI needs someone to hold hands and explain what is going on; cost goes up if you do not know how to navigate those things

- For BMR units, we need to change the way HOA fee allocations happen, because right now we cannot disaggregate low-income residents and have them paying lower HOA fees.

How can we make the existing actions more concrete to increase accountability?

- Provide funds to support community ownership- community impact fund like Little Tokyo did in LA that allows for community stewardship by the JJA community
- It is unclear what “limiting zoning changes’ means in III.5.c
When rezoning does happen, we need the requirement to ensure the benefits go to low-income communities and POC; We need to recapture the value of that giveaway. Bayview is zoned for agriculture and industrial, does it mean changing to housing, remediating, and prioritizing us for housing? We need to be sure the soil is cleaned and the water needs to be monitored. Zoning changes need to be made to other parts of the city, not our neighborhoods. We don’t need less housing. We need you to upzone other neighborhoods to remove the burden from us. We are not talking about the fact that we have allowed the market to be artificially high, we are hemorrhaging money into an unregulated market rate; we are chasing a moving target. The city has a habit of planning for who we wish to live here not for those living here; We should start by taking a good look at what would it take to keep middle-income Black residents.

D. Small and Medium Sized Buildings
August 24, 2021

Relevant Draft Goals, Policies and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase housing choice along Rapid bus and rail corridors and near major transit stops in High Opportunity Neighborhoods through zoning changes and streamlining approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Increase capacity for residential development through changes to height limits, removal of density controls, and other zoning changes to improve feasibility of multi-family buildings especially midrise buildings along SFMTA’s Rapid networks and major nodes such as Geary blvd., Judah Street, 19th Ave, Lombard Street, Ocean Ave, Taravel Street, West Portal Ave, and Van Ness Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Identify community benefits that would allow streamlined approval of midrise multi-family buildings within High Opportunity Areas, such as units serving middle-income households, inclusionary requirements, land dedication for permanently affordable housing, or ground floor space for neighborhood serving community facilities or businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase housing choice by allowing and facilitating small multi-family buildings in low-density areas within High Opportunity Neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Transition to using building form and scale (e.g. Height and bulk requirements) and unit minimums to regulate development instead of lot-based unit maximums in low-density zoned residential districts in High Opportunity Neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Identify community benefits that would allow streamlined approval of small multi-family buildings in High Opportunity Areas such as units serving middle-income households, affordable housing fees, or ground floor space for neighborhood serving community facilities or businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Improve financial feasibility of small multi-family buildings by promoting appropriate construction types, financing, or incentives to small-scale developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce development constraints such as high construction cost and lengthy City-permitting timeline to increase housing choices and improve affordability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Expand the use of cost-efficient construction types such as modular and materials such as cross laminated timber.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Support more efficient construction process by increasing flexibility of lot size limits for allowing lot consolidation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Reduce approval time and process by eliminating Planning Commission hearings for State Density Bonus project applications that do not otherwise require them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV.3  h  Expand projects types that are eligible for streamlined or ministerial review (relying on Prop E models or SB35) beyond projects with 50-100 percent permanently affordable housing.

IV.3  j  Develop Objective Design Standards that reduce subjective design review of housing projects while ensuring that new development in existing neighborhoods adheres to key urban design principles.

IV.3  k  Pursue California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Streamlining for projects through Community Plan Exemptions or by adopting Housing Sustainability Districts where possible.

V.4  a  Facilitate small multi-family buildings as a prominent housing type that private development can deliver to serve middle-income households.

V.4  b  Identify and promote construction types, financing, and design that would make small multi-family buildings feasible.

V.4  c  Transition to using building form and scale (e.g. Height and bulk requirements) and unit minimums to regulate development instead of lot-based unit maximums in the low-density zoned residential districts in High Opportunity Neighborhoods.

Discussion Notes:

What is important to keep?

- increasing SB35, housing sustainability districts; Prop E; those are critical to have
- Exchanging streamlining for community benefits
  - I like community benefits + streamlining as a package (HSD, SB35, prop E); III.6b, IV.3, III.7 These are all of a piece, they work together
  - Removing the discretionary element of the development process is always a desirable objective when talking about production; what do we get out of not streamlining?
  - The approval process leaves out community benefits and labor needs, and that’s what I’m trying to get.
  - The nature of the development process throws overboard labor concerns and community benefits; as we improve the process, that is what we want to integrate into the streamlining
  - When there are things we all agree about, exchanging benefits for streamlining makes a lot of sense
  - It’s important to talk about labor outside community benefits. Labor laws created challenges, it is critically important to find a way that new construction provides good family standard jobs. SF has been better, but it has become leverage. We talk about getting rid of any kind of leverage. But you have to make sure that every upzoning and streamlining is accompanied by labor standards.

What’s Missing?

- There was quite a bit of discussion of the value of Objective Design Standards and removing design review.
  - I’m willing to [eliminate public hearings] for objective style guidelines, how it looks is irrelevant as long as it is safe
  - I partly disagree. Downzoning in the 70s was often a reaction to poor design in the 50s and 60s. Having some level of design review for aesthetic objectives is important. Big
fan of objective design standards. The goal is not perfection but that buildings look decent.

- Some level of design review is important to prevent backlash; it doesn't have to cost a lot of money or create a lot of burden
- It's possible to write good form-based standards
- I like having design standards and a standard that is the same across the city and that helps the equity piece, no matter what neighborhood it is; eliminates the issue of equity
- So many of developable sites are unique, that makes it hard to standardize
- The newer inclusionary developments remind me of former “projects.” They are just going to look like impoverished communities later. It may be a RAD development or have an appearance of newness, but there is still not a lot of open space
- Simple rules that people can follow is good, but individual rules makes it hard
- Follow East Coast and Texas example and offer a set of by-right duplex and fourplex designs; So anyone can grab the drawings and go to town
  - I love this fourplex idea; a lot of time what stops things from going through we get afraid of what the political response, instead of taking the idea and make it work

- Can we use small and medium sites to create housing for the COP holders and work in partnership with them throughout the planning phase.
- Streamlining is super important but a specific approval timeline needs to be added; state level legislation has added required timelines, local should mandate that too.
- There was discussion about creating rules for what kinds of demolition should be required.
  - One thing that is missing is that [for four-plexes to happen] we would have to make it easier to demolish existing buildings; Its not feasible if we are only using the soft site list
  - The entire nature of demolition will erupt at the Planning Commission. We need to define objective standards as what constitutes allowable demolition.
  - We should make sure demolition focuses on adding units not just expanding units.
  - If we can knock down garages to build ADUs, why not homes to replace with a duplex, 2, 3 or 4
  - Are these older empty homes? Taking down older homes, make sure that demolition is not occupied or has a renter; owner occupied or empty could be the standard. Keep people housed, age in place but create more opportunities of homeownership.
  - The key is making sure tenants are not getting affected, maybe use something similar as ADUs not allowed where there’s a history of eviction
- Most people are not developers, they don’t want to go through DBI, give people who are sitting on some equity a mechanism to take advantage of that equity without affecting others (tenants)
- Right to return sounds good but tenant advocates have concerns about housing during construction.
- Preventing tenants from being displaced is much better than trying to provide replacement housing.
- There was a discussion about the High Opportunity Areas map.
  - Having these policies apply to the entirety of west side is too broad, focus on some of the socioeconomic questions more directly. I want us to concentrate on high homeownership neighborhoods; I’m suggesting we define these areas more clearly as
areas where more people live in SFHs, we need to desegregate those areas specifically. Until you start putting more multifamily units into these places, you will get a lot more unwelcomed and unwarranted resistance from the wealthy.

- The transit corridor is underwhelming and lacks vision. It’s inadequate. The foundation is not great.
  - Abandon it, not visionary
  - It doesn’t feel fair for people that live in the southeast, those property owners may be left out of this
  - Neighbors will use the lack of sufficient transit on those corridors to stop the conversation
  - Every community is different, but to paint with such a broad brush is a mistake.
  - In a general sense, if we are talking about increasing density through projects like LIHTC we cannot also say is next to a mid-rise LIHTC project

- We’re leaving out homeowners in the east side
- We need to direct investment where we will get the biggest bang for the buck; give lower income people more places to live.

• There was a discussion of modular housing/factory built housing
  - if HCD is the one certifying modular construction, the building trades won’t be supportive
    - If the city wanted to encourage faster construction it would be better to remove hearings and not impact the local construction trades
    - Jon - what if Planning expanded the use of constructions types; incentives for builders (IV.3a)
  - The trades passed a resolution opposing modular for affordable construction ensuring that is built to local standards, not state standards
  - SB35 ends up abating the skilled trade requirements and offshoring out of SF to low-wage locals; having this language about modular in the Housing Element is like a red cape. You should remove it completely.
  - The City should put all its power into regaining control over modular
  - The president of Planning Commission is not a big fan of modular construction
  - We are conflating cross laminated timber and modular. Those should be separated. There’s not opposition to cross laminated timber. You need to have appropriate approval from building and safety. CLT needs to get the credit that it deserves. The City needs to do work that makes it easier to use these products - “examine building code" to make sure it’s up to date. It’s behind the times.
  - We have one CLT building (commercial) but it couldn’t go higher because of the building codes. It was built all union. Don’t do what LA did.
  - I think we should be pursuing any innovations (such as modular). There’s a political piece to it that’s significant. We should focus on building political will at the Board of Supervisors and in compliance with what HCD is going to require.

**Biggest take away- most important thing HE should include**

- Developers from the equity lens. Make sure are people of color/local/what these units should and could look like, as well as cost effectiveness, and what does it do for the tenant
E. Middle-Income Housing
August 3, 2021

Relevant Draft Goals, Policies and Actions

Subsidized Strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Pursue public private partnerships on public sites to deliver a maximum number of permanently affordable units on those sites by leveraging private investments in market-rate units with public funding permanently affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retain and increase the moderate- and middle-income households through building permanently affordable workforce housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Continue to support educator housing programs and seek to expand its application to other public-sector essential workers such as transit operators and hospital workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Pursue new partnership models to allow non-City financing of moderate- and middle-income homeownership through parallel development of smaller sized lots that are scattered (such as Habitat for Humanity models).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Subsidized Strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase housing choice by allowing and facilitating small multi-family buildings in low-density areas within High Opportunity Neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Transition to using building form and scale (e.g. Height and bulk requirements) and unit minimums to regulate development instead of lot-based unit maximums in low-density zoned residential districts in High Opportunity Neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Identify certain community benefits that would allow streamlined approval of small multi-family buildings in High Opportunity Areas such as units serving middle-income households, affordable housing fees, or ground floor space for neighborhood serving community facilities or businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Improve financial feasibility of small multi-family buildings by promoting appropriate construction types, financing, or incentives to small-scale developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce development constraints such as high construction cost and lengthy City-permitting timeline to increase housing choices and improve affordability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Reduce approval time and process by eliminating Planning Commission hearings for State Density Bonus project applications that do not otherwise require them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Expand projects types that are eligible for streamlined or ministerial review (relying on Prop E models or SB35) beyond projects with 50-100 percent permanently affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.6</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Provide paths for large employers to contribute funding in partnership with non-profit developers to provide homeownership opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursue code and policy changes to encourage new housing projects and major expansion projects build to maximum allowable unit density and discourage major expansions of existing single-family homes where additional units are otherwise permitted.

Allow conversion of existing single-family homes to group housing units.

Allow group housing as a principally permitted use where residential use is allowed.

(for ADUs) Continue to streamline the permit process through interagency coordination (e.g. Roundtable Review) implement an integrated online permitting system to support permit streamlining and government transparency.

Encourage Junior ADUs (JADUs) as an effective and low-cost way of adding habitable space within existing single-family homes, as JADUs also expand opportunities for multi-generational living.

Discussion Notes:
What is important to keep?

- Using public sites for affordable housing; units need subsidy, so availability of land for these units
- Expand project types eligible for ministerial approval. This would encourage the private market to have more certainty and lower the price of the units
- III.7 (small multi-family buildings) - I love both of the bolded things; when we are deed-restricting to middle income, the process to get into housing needs conversation. It may need its own policy discussion
- Ill.8d (public sites) - There is a lot of interest in truly social housing, that can be built cross-subsidized on public land; we are really just talking about NGOs or market rate deed-restricted units
- I am questioning whether middle-income should be part of inclusionary.
- Encouraging employers to contribute industry specific housing (IV.6c), specifically around homeownership opportunity, for long term stay, and creating generational wealth. Homeownership should not be taken away from those communities
- Homeownership models over social housing- there may be interest in social housing that’s owned by the city. Keeping it within the non-profit industry makes sense. We have a clear legacy of what City owned housing has looked like, projects that are a hot mess right now; preserve by keeping it in the non-profit sector
- How do people get on that list and apply for that housing for middle-income deed-restriction; getting income-certified is a lot of work; make easier and better
- I like the bifurcation between subsidized vs. Non-subsidized. How can we encourage middle income housing without subsidies? On the non-subsidized, I would mention parking requirements.
- For the smaller projects (2-10 unit) try to get as many of these as possible, with limited parking, I wouldn’t require additional deed-restriction if we aren’t putting public subsidy onto those units
  - Agreed regarding streamlining/deed restrictions being different for smaller and larger projects
  - JPA model for moderate income deed restricted tax exemption with tax exempt bonds. It’s worth exploring.
  - If there will be policy intervention to do something, there has to be some kind of community benefit in some way. The question is what is that?
It’s not good policy or realistic politics if there is no good public benefit; I don’t think that flies.

For our community, advocates are the ones who watch development happen in their community but don’t have access to. There needs to be community benefits.

Laura - there are feasibility studies if we are going to be talking about any cost to small scale building specially in high opportunity neighborhoods; its easier to have the conversation that ‘housing is the community benefit’

Take money from high resource to low resource – smaller fee that they pay to MOHCD that goes to building affordable housing. That’s better than the fact that they have to manage the community benefits.

Figure out what it is that we need to do; we think that if we do streamlining will do x; maybe x needs something else

The upzoning of property isn’t just “removing a barrier” it is giving value to the property owner.

I wouldn't want to lose III.7 (small multi-family buildings). I feel that that is an important component of this discussion; really interesting to see the administration for units that are deed-restricted. Allowing small multifamily building is an important component to this discussion. In the process of delivering 30% 120-150% AMI units, it’s been interesting to see the administration of those units, and how they are being treated, some of the approach not allowing banding really increase the rent-burden there and makes them less available and attractive

- It remains to be seen whether this program is working. Right now we’re setting the implementation rules. It’s unfortunate to have restrictions that low income units don’t have (because they are not section 415 units) ; we are still early on, have not marketed them yet; we are setting up the implementation, it is unfortunate that those units may be more difficult because of not allowing banding and other restrictions; it has more to do that they aren’t section 415 units, but through DAs

We appreciate that there’s subsidized and non-subsidized, how to continue to support nonprofit developers through the streamlining process

- We need to emphasize the role of shared equity: CLT or deed restrictions. It’s important for owners to build equity.
- Importance of the shared-equity model to preserve the affordability of this units and the investment of the city
- I agree. Social housing is a squishy term. But long-term affordability is good. Deed restriction is one mechanism, but not the only; is there an affordability mechanism or not (undefined term). There are a lot of creative models that could be worked with and scaled.

Also, co-ops and land trusts are on our list of essential ideas/ things we should not lose

Land trusts and equity share is also a methodology of affordability, that would preserve the affordability through the life of a building.

ADUs are on the list. The most viable thing that can happen quickly with small capital is adding ADUs through new construction or conversion. It’s already happening. We are cutting edge when nobody else is doing it.
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Why are we moving faster and more efficiently for ADUs only, bureaucracy should be faster for all units, that should be better government. The cumbersome permitting process mostly happens inside the government. Don’t rely on small number of actors that have a rigid criteria. Natural affordability of ADUs at broad scale and geography.

Echoing support for ADUs and process improvements to allow for more ADUs to come on line faster

Echo support for ADUs, way to add meaningful amounts of housing without a lot community opposition, would like to see the City work on making these easier

III.7 (small multi-family buildings) is important, in general important when we see leg that intersects with these policies and strategies; reducing approval time really helps

I have a small concern with III.7 b, I just want to flag that High Opportunity Areas have more community serving amenities in them, why are we asking for community benefits there? We don’t want to say in addition to middle income housing as a benefit, we don’t want to say provide ground floor space for a specific use.

What’s nice is that the state isn’t giving us much of a choice: we have to change our policies to accommodate 82,000 units.

What’s Missing:

There are a number of places that it’s unclear if we are talking about affordable or not (non deed restricted). It should be clarified. Last item in subsidized strategies; are we talking about permanently affordable, limited-equity, etc; first item under non-subsidized, are we talking about affordability more generally.

There is no reference here to HOMESF, 4-5 years ago it took a lot of oxygen; it was key incentive program for middle income housing; replaced by State density; how can we make it incentivize enough to be taken?

Be clear about what you mean by ‘Habitat for Humanity model.’ For me it is about shared-equity model (deed restriction and land trusts). Habitat does not always focus on smaller sized lots.

Under policy V.3, the reference to subsidy is around down payment assistance, if we want to make it a long-term commitment to community stability, and housing stability, the investment should move beyond down payment assistance and towards deed restricted (or other shared equity models)

With regards to educator housing, Midpen is doing one for SFUSD in the sunset, it’ll be educators; the existential question around that is why this one job classification? if others are making the same amount of money, why should they not get prioritized?

Asking for community benefits in order to get streamlining wouldn’t work. It’s important to have long-term deed restricted affordability.

We need to outline how we will help homeowners to develop their own property. Maybe they want to sell it to a small-scale developer, but maybe they want to become a landlord. It’s important to think about demolishing their own home.

I wouldn’t require some sort of deed restriction for streamlining middle income units.

Do we have an actual typology that’s been worked through to be tested that has been nibbled around the edges; certain typology for a site, this is something that could be done scalable; what needs to change is these three conditions; on the back end to know that it is working, what is being produced and who is using them? Are they turning around to high income or staying in
the hands of middle-income residents. Can we look at it in 6 months or a year, and figure out if it’s working, or are they holding. We need some testing metrics. Without that, these are conceptual theories and promises that are being made.

- One more "missing" detail from this mod/middle housing policy rubric: incentivizing or/and requiring larger family-sized housing units, 3-bdrms

Which Actions Could be More Concrete?

- Improve financial feasibility of small multi-family buildings by promoting appropriate construction types, financing, or incentives to small-scale developers
- Expand project types eligible for ministerial approval. It would encourage the private market to have more certainty and lower the price of the units.
- Group housing is demonized in high income neighborhoods. Principally permit it. Streamlining should be in a way that it actually gets built.
- Planning has a tracking tool: quarterly development dashboard used to track implementation here; production according to specific income levels across the various stages of the pipeline; track them through their life cycle; hasn’t been updated in more than 2 years
- Deed restriction is one mechanism on affordability but its not the only one. Refinements, number of places in both sections that aren't clear if we are talking about "affordable" or just whatever; important to be clear on that; what is deed-restricted and what isn’t.
- Talk about co-ops if that’s a successful affordability strategy.

Of all the actions, which would make the most difference in supply of affordable housing?

- ADU incentives
- HomeSF incentives
- Public Lands mixed-income affordable housing
- III.7 - Small multi family buildings
- III.8 (Public sites) and V.3 (Permanently affordable workforce housing)
- III.7 c - allow owner occupied demolition of buildings without Conditional Use Permit;
- V.5a (Conversion to group homes) is going to be really rare. It’s super specific, but not going to be a large source of housing. V.5 c (Group homes as principally permitted use) could become way more common

F. Increasing Accountability for the Housing Element

October 5, 2021

Relevant Draft Goals, Policies and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy or Action</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1a</td>
<td>Create an implementation plan for the annual funding resulting from the new gross receipt tax to increase acquisition and construction of permanently supportive housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1c</td>
<td>Standardize a list of indicators that measure housing needs and challenges for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color to incorporate into any analysis supporting community planning processes or proposed housing policy or legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td>Embrace the guidance of community leaders representing American Indian, Black, and other People of Color throughout the planning and implementation of housing solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2a</td>
<td>Ensure elevated representation of American Indian, Black, and other Communities of Color in decision making bodies such as Community Advisory Councils (CACs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2b</td>
<td>Increase Planning Department resources and staff allocation to build capacity and partnerships with Community-based organizations that primarily serve and represent American Indian, Black, other People of Color across all department functions, including long-range planning, program implementation, and regulatory review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2d</td>
<td>Identify and implement priority strategies recommended by advisory bodies primarily serving and representing American Indian, Black, and other People of Color such as the African American Reparations Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3</td>
<td>Amplify and prioritize voices of American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in the City’s engagement processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3a</td>
<td>Fund and coordinate with community-based organizations primarily serving and representing American Indian, Black, other People of Color for inclusive outreach and engagement and meaningful participation in planning processes related to housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3b</td>
<td>Engage and gather input from underserved and underrepresented communities in the early stages of neighborhood and community planning processes and housing policy development through focus groups, surveys, and during community engagement events through funded partnerships with community-based organizations that primarily serve and represent People of Color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4</td>
<td>Measure racial and social equity in each step of the planning process for housing to assess and pursue ways to achieve beneficial outcomes for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4a</td>
<td>Develop and align department-wide metrics to evaluate progress on housing policies advancing racial equity based on and consistent with the San Francisco Equity Index prepared by the Office of Racial Equity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4b</td>
<td>Assess and implement resources in the City’s housing work program areas and investments that proactively advance racial and social equity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4c</td>
<td>Develop and implement an impact analysis approach that seeks to identify racial, social, and health inequities related to plans or development projects of certain scope or scale and identify mitigation measures or alternative strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2a</td>
<td>Develop equity metrics and criteria to identify the necessary infrastructure improvements to guide all investment decisions made through a variety of policies and procedures including: Capital Planning, General Plan Elements, Interagency Plan Implementation Committee or Citizen Advisory Council review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.2f</td>
<td>Pursue interagency coordination to plan for improvements to transit, pedestrian, and bike infrastructure and service, and providing those improvements before housing projects are completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.2b</td>
<td>Pursue interagency coordination to facilitate planning for and providing equitable access to community facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion Notes:

What does accountability mean?

Some participants saw ‘accountability’ in terms of communities being able to get what they want and having power

- For me accountability is who has the ability to shut down a project?
- Asking or committing to us having the ability to stop a project? Land continues to be developed and there has been no tribal consultation.
- American Indians want to see some action, we are getting tired of the land acknowledgment; we are not talking about the past, we are talking about the present.
- We need to bring the past to the present: is there agency today? Still continuing impacts that need to be dealt with?
- Is there a level playing field between developers and community advocates?
- When we propose the idea of selection by race, we are told that is not allowed; we are trying to heal our community, but we are told that is not a possibility.
- If whatever was on the table still went through, then it feels like our voices weren’t heard.
- There is a feeling in all our communities of color that we have been fighting for this for eons; just the idea of having to wait for this for longer feels daunting; people want it now, they want to see it right away.
- I don’t read anything that says creating a partnership, delegating power, control of our communities; that is real control, the rest is tokenism.
- No matter how much we go out there, they are not going to believe this is real until we see dramatic changes in who is here and who has access to the housing.
- Giving all the power is not going to happen; who had power over, it’s really about sharing the power.
- Yes, it needs to be creative and new according to the cultures and definitely needs to be led from the ground up. I understand the intricacies around coordination etc, but the only way to change minds is by sharing that “at the top” power. True voice in the problems, solutions, and implementation.
- 100% it’s power, and the housing element will be a bust if those who have it now don’t share it.
- It has to be shared, not completely given over in all areas. It is about saying we are not holding all the cards but we have equal parts of the deck.
- If supervisors need a “statement of overriding concerns” to ignore CEQA, why isn’t one considered for decision that violate community groups’ values? Put on the record why community groups’ concerns and values are being overridden.
- Does this project promote racial equity and reverse past harms? If yes, approve it, if not, reject it.

While others seemed to see it more in terms of transparency and sharing information

- Only the Mayor has the power to pressure departments to comply with/be accountable to the Housing Element policies and enforcement.
It’s a policy document; if we take it to the aspirational level (like a constitution) if what we are really trying to achieve we have to design our metrics within the politics space.

I think prioritizing on being actionable w/ metrics would be more beneficial. (E.g. instead of focusing on ”reporting”, focus on “what’s the delta between our estimated target vs Actual target?”). you are talking about report backs, who picks the metrics? The community you are reporting back to picks that. How is the language built around reporting those metrics back? Getting the data, collecting the data, algorithms, etc needs to go through community filtration.

How do we measure the outcomes of what happens relative to the expectations?

At the very fundamental level, this requires a look back to see what worked and what didn’t.

The Planning Dept doesn’t have a good track record on monitoring outcomes of the Housing Element and/or taking the monitoring/accounting seriously to reshape/course correct policy that isn't working or is having unintended consequences.

How folks are held accountable to monitoring and acting on metrics when things are off course is the key.

One person saw accountability in legal terms:

- There needs to be some kind of legal mechanism to obligate accountability over time; it’s a moving target.
- City law should permit citizens to appeal Planning and other decisions to the BoS based on their consistency with the general plan.

Others disagreed:

- I hope that we don’t resort to a litigious politics to implement the housing element.

**Who do we need to be accountable to?**

- Accountability is always best when it completely includes, at every step, the people that it’s trying to help. Having ongoing meetings [like the ones in] this Housing Element process has been very enriching, the longer that it happens, the more people know about it; its been really empowering and people have felt heard.
- Looking at the process of who sits at the table with the architecture design and planning.
- Accountability to the orgs that support the people.
- The community should be creating the plan, if you want a model of this, it is not super successful yet but the Regional Air Quality Districts have to have the community there from the beginning to the very end; that is the kind of thing that needs to happen here.
  - You need to let the community decide; for each community that is going to look very different.
  - Community is messy; you cannot prescribe from afar what is appropriate for every community.
- Communities who have been impacted by the harm; discriminatory housing policies; that is who [the Housing Element] needs to be accountable to.
How do we achieve greater accountability?

Participants mentioned a number of specific ideas including:

Townhalls/community meetings

- Providing spaces on an ongoing basis like this one and the housing element update 2022 year-round.
- We’d love to have a townhall
- We can have townhalls for everyone, but we will lose engagement if people don’t feel heard
- We need a combination of all of those, meetings, reports, plans, etc and that in a couple of years there are outcomes; all along the way you have all those steps and regular meetings and report backs
- The metrics lean very heavily on outreach/engagement, but less so on outcomes. Is the idea that this outreach and engagement will help the department focus on the right outcomes, and how do we effectively measure them? We could make that an explicit goal of the outreach and engagement.
- Be careful of the pantomime of public participation. Quantity of outreach does not equate to quality of engagement
- Can you do it by district and activate the Supervisors offices to facilitate?
- It would be more effective and helpful to develop individual fact sheets in specific communities and take those to the communities (displacement and homelessness); taking that individualized update to communities and sharing them. This would be more effective than a large scale public meetings.
- We should be leaning on the cultural districts because the boards already have representation
- Maybe codifying the Cultural Districts work should be a policy? Or putting more teeth into their work?

Financial support for CBOs

- assign 1% (more/less?) of TOT to identified community groups
- Partnership is figuring out who your partners are and funding them
- I really struggle with this idea that public institutions invest in community organizing so that those CBOs can have the resources, bandwidth, but I know that the alternative is that small grass roots orgs don’t have that capacity

Strengthening Internal City Structures

- Does the Planning Commission have any members that provide input on equity?
- We need a Planning Department equity ombudsperson who is nominated by the mayor and confirmed by BOS so they are politically insulated and can call out inequitable practices and projects; have them submit a staff report for land use-related decisions before decision-making bodies
We need Equity commissioners to join the Planning Commission to better represent the diverse needs of marginalized and/or injured communities, such as a person with a disability, a person experiencing homelessness or who is formerly homeless, a representative of local Indigenous people, etc.

Creating new bodies and enhancing the bodies that already exist; if the people creating the harm continue to appoint those people, then we will reproduce systems.

We can continue to create advisory boards but I’m not sure how they will make a difference if they do not have authority on upholding accountability or power in decision making.

If community members want to hold the city accountable, they need to be explicit about which departments have responsibility and what those outcomes look like.

There is a tendency for SF Planning to treat the General Plan as a plan for the department not the whole city; it cannot be a lose connection of tasks.

How about a housing department, with a housing commission, combining the MOHCD, Housing Authority, and OCII?

Stronger Metrics

As far as metrics: one thought is that if you break it down over time you don’t have this big target floating out there; pick out pieces of the HE that we are going to be accountable right away; responsible over time instead of having some far out goal.

There is dashboard that is supposed to provide every quarter; RHNA track every quarter by income level; allows policy makers to see; it doesn’t have a racial analysis; transparency on production; department hasn’t done it in two years.

Health - we could measure progress towards a healthy community strategy, and evaluate how well we’re doing at health hazards in housing - mold, asbestos, lead, ventilation/indoor air quality.

Resiliency - we should measure how we’re doing in making our housing, particularly rent-stabilized and affordable, earthquake safe, and ready for flood and heat waves.

DPH has identified census tracts with health disparities. We could measure progress towards reducing the housing-related elements of health disparity.

Timelines/Deadlines

I would suggest adding dates or deadlines; helpful in terms of accountability and helping the community hold the department accountable.
# APPENDIX E.
Community Conversation List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Group</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino Task Force</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Latin@/x community coalition responding to the COVID-19 pandemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rights Committee (HRC)</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Tenant rights advocacy organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Door Legal</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Legal aid nonprofit serving Bayview, Excelsior, and Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Youth Commission</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Advisory board to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Disability Action (SDA)</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Advocacy organization and service provider for seniors and people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Street Youth Services</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Advocacy organization and service provider for youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Beach Neighbors</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>North Beach neighborhood association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR)</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Richmond neighborhood association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMI Community Collaborative (OMI-CC)</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Oceanview-Merced-Ingleside neighborhood association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MegaBlack</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Coalition of Black San Franciscan residents and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPUR</td>
<td>Community conversation; Letter</td>
<td>Nonprofit public policy organization focusing on planning, housing, and other urban issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Coalition of nonprofits and service providers serving the Bayview-Hunters Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Community conversation; Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Coalition of SF neighborhood organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderloin People's Congress</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Coalition of Tenderloin-based organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco League of Conservation Voters</td>
<td>Community conversation; Letter</td>
<td>Environmental advocacy organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga Neighborhood Improvement Association</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Outer Mission neighborhood association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo'MAGIC</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Coalition of service providers and nonprofits serving the Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council’s Public Policy Committee</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Association of San Francisco construction unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview-Hunters Point community conversation</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Community meeting with residents of the Bayview-Hunters Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco YIMBY Action</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Housing advocacy organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Emergency Services Provider Association (HESPA)</td>
<td>Community conversation</td>
<td>Coalition of homelessness service providers and advocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miraloma Park Improvement Club</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Miraloma Park neighborhood association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Coalition of nonprofits, service providers, and advocacy organizations organizing in response to Housing Element Update 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Land Use Coalition</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Coalition advocating on land use issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaze Forward Fellows – San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Training program for transitional age youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX F.
Community Conversations Coding Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Identity</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                  | Cultural Heritage and Preservation | • Architectural & aesthetic preservation  
• Cultural Heritage (intangible, and small business)  
• Other cultural preservation and heritage considerations |
|                  | Environmental Justice | • Site contamination/remediation  
• Other environmental justice considerations |
|                  | Homelessness elimination and prevention | • Shelters and navigation centers  
• Supportive housing and services  
• Other forms of homelessness interventions (rental subsidy, transitional housing, rapid rehousing) |
|                  | Homeownership and economic mobility | • BMR homeownership access and challenges  
• Low-income homeowners (challenges and needs)  
• Down payment and mortgage assistance  
• Economic mobility  
• Other affordable homeownership considerations |
|                  | Diversity of housing types | • Families with children  
• ADUs/in-law units  
• Small and mid-size multi-family housing  
• Group housing  
• Senior housing  
• Other housing types |
|                  | Housing Production | • Development review & approval process (streamlining, CBAs, etc.)  
• Rehabilitation & adaptive reuse  
• Zoning change (increase height and density)  
• Construction or labor costs  
• Transit-oriented development  
• Other housing production considerations |
|                  | Equitably resourced, vibrant, and walkable neighborhoods | • Public safety  
• Work & employment opportunities  
• Parking  
• Community gathering & public spaces  
• Transit improvements  
• Commercial amenities  
• Other neighborhood resources |
|                  | Equity-Centered Processes and Community Engagement | • Engagement fatigue & retraumatization  
• CBOs and community partners  
• Language access & cultural competency  
• Accountability  
• Direct outreach to residents  
• Other community engagement considerations |
|                  | Equitable access to affordable housing resources | • Income requirements  
• Lottery and application process  
• Priority and preferences  
• Other affordable housing access considerations |
|                  | Permanently affordable housing production and investment | • 100% affordable housing  
• Mixed-income affordable housing  
• Other affordable housing production/investment considerations |
|                  | Preservation of affordability and Improving Conditions of Existing Housing | • Small sites for rent control  
• Single-room occupancy residential hotels (SROs) or hotel conversions  
• Existing deed restricted affordable housing  
• Other preservation of affordability considerations |
|                  | Community stability and tenant protections | • Tenant rights and eviction protection  
• Housing vouchers & rent subsidies  
• Other community stability considerations |
|                  | Reparations | |
|                  | Interagency Coordination & Citywide Policy | |
APPENDIX G.
Written Comments and Responses

September 2, 2021

Kimia Haddadan
Housing Element Project Manager
Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Ave., Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
kimia.haddadan@sfgov.org

Dear Ms. Haddadan:

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters (SFLCV) strongly supports the draft Housing Element’s emphasis on how housing policies must play a crucial role in establishing racial, social, and economic justice and equity in San Francisco. As explained in more detail below, we:

- Support the draft Element’s emphasis on overcoming inequitable housing policies and practices;
- Support its call for providing more housing, especially affordable housing, in High Opportunity Neighborhoods and along major transit corridors;
- Urge more explicit discussion about how the Element’s policies further the City’s and the State’s climate change goals;
- Recommend clarification about how proposed policy language limiting rezonings in Priority Geographies will interact with proposed policy language calling for additional housing near transit nodes and along major transit corridors;
- Call for the Element to identify a sufficient supply of potential housing sites to meet updated RHNA targets;
- Support providing ample opportunities for historically excluded communities to participate meaningfully in the adoption and implementation of the Element; and
- Stress the need for expeditious action to complete and carry out the policies of the Element.

For far too long, housing policies, investments, and practices have denied social and economic opportunity on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, class, and wealth. Those policies, investments, and practices have also had serious environmental consequences: destruction of environmentally sensitive habitat for the sake of sprawl development, excessive consumption of natural resources, wasteful use of energy, and mounting greenhouse gas emissions that are fundamentally transforming the earth’s climate.
The high cost of housing in San Francisco is prohibitive for most middle- and lower-income households, driving up the City’s deplorable rates of homelessness, forcing many long-time residents to move to the exurban fringes of the Bay Area or beyond, and tearing apart the fabric of many lower-income communities of color. Many who work in San Francisco have no hope of ever living here and must endure long commutes, too often by automobile.

Any plan for addressing the social and economic injustices and the environmental harm that the current housing crisis in San Francisco causes must dramatically increase the supply of housing for all income levels - and most especially the supply of affordable housing. In the past two decades, the City’s planning efforts have focused on a subset of neighborhoods mostly located in the eastern half of the City and many of which house(d) lower-income communities of color. Those plans have provided for sometimes dramatic and controversial changes in neighborhoods that are also experiencing displacement and gentrification, but have not been sufficient to alleviate the City’s shortage of housing or its exorbitant cost. It is long past time for the many neighborhoods throughout the City that have not provided a significant amount of new housing in recent decades and that do not face the same risks of gentrification and displacement to contribute their fair share.

SFLCV therefore strongly supports the provisions of the draft Housing Element that call for dramatically increasing the amount of new housing for all income levels in “High Opportunity Neighborhoods.” SFLCV endorses the measures that call for allowing larger multi-family structures at major transit nodes and near Muni’s Rapid lines. It also supports allowing smaller-scale multi-family housing such as four-plexes in neighborhoods located further away from major transit routes and that currently have lower density zoning.

One surprising omission from the draft Element is its silence about how San Francisco’s housing policies must advance the City’s and the State’s goals for addressing the climate crisis. (See Resolution Declaring Climate Emergency (SFBOS Resolution No. 160-19); San Francisco Climate Action Strategy (Update 2013); California Air Resources Board, California’s 2017 Climate Action Scoping Plan.) California’s Scoping Plan in particular stresses that the State will not be able to meet its longer-term climate goals unless local governments allow more efficient land uses that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, especially through reductions in vehicle miles traveled. (See e.g. Climate Action Scoping Plan, pp. 99-100.) Because San Franciscans on average drive substantially less than residents of the rest of the Bay Area, because many people who commute to San Francisco live in much more automobile-dependent communities, because its relatively compact urban form consumes less natural resources than more sprawled-out locations, and because San Francisco’s mild climate reduces energy demand for heating and cooling, providing more housing in San Francisco provides substantial climate and other environmental benefits. The Housing Element should expressly acknowledge those climate and environmental benefits and identify increased housing, especially affordable housing, as a core component of the City’s climate strategy. Similarly, the provisions of the Element that call for higher-density housing near transit nodes...
and major transit lanes are necessary for complying with the City Charter’s Transit First mandate. The Element should stress that its call for increased investments in transit, including additional dedicated funding for transit operations, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities, are crucial to the City’s climate strategy. Given that transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions, both statewide and citywide, it is vital to dramatically increase the share of trips by foot, bicycle, and transit.

Complementary to this, the Element should expressly provide for more multi-family housing, especially affordable housing, close to neighborhood commercial districts and major employment centers and trip generators located outside the downtown core - e.g., UCSF Parnassus Heights, San Francisco State/Stonestown, City College, the University of San Francisco, the Geary & Divisadero medical facilities, and Laguna Honda.

SFLCV notes that the draft Element’s call to “limit zoning changes within Priority Geographies to the specific needs of American Indian, Black, and other Communities of Color” raises questions about how provisions calling for additional housing near transit will be implemented in “priority geographies.” The Element should clarify what it means by limiting zoning in those areas to the “specific needs” of communities of color. Communities of color, like all communities, will include many people with a range of perspectives about their community’s specific needs. SFLCV absolutely supports the need for carefully considering and addressing the potential ways in which new housing - whether market rate or affordable - can affect existing communities. SFLCV also understands that the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process relatively recently rezoned neighborhoods with many communities of color and that those neighborhoods should not be prioritized for another round of rezoning. Other priority geographies, however, have not gone through a neighborhood planning process in recent decades despite being adjacent to major transit nodes or major transit routes. These include the areas adjacent to the Balboa Park BART station that were not included in the Balboa Park Better Neighborhoods Plan and the southern stretch of Mission Street through the Excelsior and the Outer Mission.

The draft Housing Element acknowledges that it must identify potential housing sites that are sufficient to satisfy the new, higher “Regional Housing Needs Allocation” (RHNA) targets. The Element should expressly evaluate how rezoning and other implementation provisions will provide a sufficient supply of new housing opportunities for all income ranges, taking into account the wide variety of factors that limit production of new housing even when it is legally allowed. The Element should err on the side of allowing more than is required to meet the minimum RHNA targets. San Francisco cannot afford to repeat its past housing failures. And San Franciscans definitely cannot afford for the City to continue to fail to rectify its housing shortage.

SFLCV strongly agrees that the City must provide ample opportunities for all communities - especially historically excluded lower income communities and communities of color - to participate in meaningful and substantial ways in formulating the Element and its implementation measures. The housing crisis and the climate crisis, however, require urgent action, so planning processes must also reach a timely conclusion. Once the Housing Element
and related implementation measures are adopted, the emphasis should be on rapid implementation.

In carrying out its environmental review of the Housing Element, the Planning Department should provide as complete of an environmental analysis as possible of the full range of potential measures to implement the Element. The public and decision makers are entitled to understand the environmental pros and cons of the Element and how it may be implemented. And providing that analysis up front should allow for more rapid tiered environmental review of specific implementation measures as they are adopted.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Kristina Pappas
SFLCV President

cc: Shelley Caltagirone, shelley.caltagirone@sfgov.org
SFLUC has reviewed much of the proposed Housing Element Survey, a somewhat exhaustive and complex survey. We have also looked over the responses from the Race and Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP) and agree with many of their conclusions. Our particular issues are as follows:

- We are concerned with the survey assumptions about applying different concepts to various parts of San Francisco. ‘High Opportunity Neighborhoods,’ 'Priority Development Areas,' and 'Geographic Areas' are being designated without local-based community input and information on the impact of the proposed policies on those areas. This kind of input requires more than just conceptual terms; it requires maps and specific illustrations of the impacts on each neighborhood and input from the residents as to those impacts.

- Although singling out support for people to live within "Priority Geographies" sounds beneficial, that concept also appears to make decisions for people about where they should live, instead of leaving it up to the people to decide.

- Evictions and displacement should be addressed all over San Francisco, not just one or two specific areas.

- RHNA goals have been imposed on San Francisco with no regards to community input and the risks of displacement and gentrification. Building even more market rate housing works against racial and social equity. Many of the proposals will promote incentives for market rate development and that will not solve the affordable housing problems in San Francisco. Market rate developments typically increase housing prices, speculation, displacement, and gentrification.

- For all new housing that is to be built, affordable units with deep affordability should be prioritized. We oppose relaxing inclusionary requirements or streamlining the approval process for market rate developments. In addition, streamlining approvals means taking the power of self-determination away from the very communities that many of the policies state they are trying to help.

- In publicly-owned sites and large privately-owned sites, the City needs to do away with top-down planning processes and replace with bottom-up processes which put an emphasis on gathering and implementing public input.

- In particular, public land should have only housing that is 100% affordable.
• We support community infrastructure improvements to transit, parks, streetscape, and neighborhood amenities, but agree that this must be first signed off on by the local residents and also be carefully developed so as not to lead to increased land and housing speculation and displacement of low-income residents.

• Many of the proposals will require extensive funding. The manner of raising the funding and the extent of funding should be worked out with the affected communities and reflect community input into the funding uses and allocations.

In summary, many of the proposal leave out the voices of the community and should be rewritten to include extensive outreach and a serious commitment to real participation and decision-making at the community-level.

Sincerely,

Ozzie Rohm

Ozzie Rohm for SFLUC

cc: Rich Hillis
SF Board of Supervisors
SF Planning Commission
To: SF Planning Commission
From: G. Schuttish
Date: October 10, 2019
Re: General Public Comments Today

Good morning, President Melgar, Vice President Koppel, Commissioner Moore, Commissioner Fung, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Richards and Mr. Ionin.

I hope you will have a few moments to read this before the meeting today, but I will try to amplify it in the three minutes during General Public Comment.

According to the Commission’s Staff in the past two years (2017 thru mid-2019) there have been about 35 complaints related to illegal demolitions Citywide. Thirteen (13) were confirmed as demolitions. This is 38%.

Based on the sample of five Noe Valley projects requested by Commissioner Richards in December 2015, Staff said 40% should have been classified as demolitions even though they were reviewed and approved as alterations.

This is interesting that the percentages are fundamentally the same.

These percentages, 38% and 40%, are a fact under the existing Demo Calculations in Section 317 of the Planning Code in subsections (b) (2) (B) and (b) (2) (C).

Now to shift gears a little bit.

The first sentence explaining the position of Planning Director of the City and County of San Francisco’s HR website reads:

“San Francisco Planning Department’s mission is to shape the future of San Francisco and the region by: Generating an extraordinary vision for the General Plan..... “

On page C.6 of the “2014 Housing Element of the General Plan, Objective 2, Conserve and Improve Existing Stock” it says:

“Planning shall continue to implement the recently adopted Planning Code Section 317, which codifies review criteria for allowing housing demolitions, conversion and mergers, amend it when necessary...”

However, the Commission has never, ever adjusted the Demo Calcs as written in Section 317 (b) (2) (D) which was:

“...necessary to implement the intent of this Section 317 to conserve existing sound housing and preserve affordable housing”.

Or in other words: “policy efficacy”.

1
But at the same time the value in RH-1 has been adjusted at least five times since 2013 to reflect both the market and the concept of “naturally unaffordable” and allow the administrative approval of demolitions.

In fact the 2014 Housing Element recognized this issue on page I.34 writing:

“With the global recession, prices dropped between 2005 and 2011. Since 2011, the price of housing in San Francisco continues to grow and based on the trend since 2000, the price of housing is projected to surpass the high prices seen in 2005.”

In fact these high prices in the years prior to the adoption of Section 317 and the increase in demolitions was a reason Section 317 was created in order to preserve sound affordable housing while allowing for reasonable alterations in the RH-2 and RH-3 and in those RH-1 neighborhoods that were still affordable.

The 2014 Housing Element Policy 2.2 reads:

“Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing, unless the demolition results in a net increase in affordable housing.”

And the 2014 Housing Element Policy 3.4 reads:

“Preserve”naturally affordable” housing types, such as smaller and older ownership units.”

And in further detail it goes on to say:

“A review of current sales prices reveals that new homes are generally priced higher than existing, older housing stock. This is particularly true of smaller units, such as the mid-century construction in certain lower density residential neighborhoods. These housing units provide a unique homeownership opportunity for new and smaller households. While higher density housing generally results in more shared costs among each unit, the pre-existing investment in lower density housing generally outweighs the benefits of higher density in terms of housing affordability. To the extent that lower density older housing units respond to this specific housing need, without requiring public subsidy they should be preserved. Strategies detailed under Object 2 to retain existing housing units, and promote their life -long stability should be used to support this housing stock.”

During General Public Comment over the past 5 years the Commission has seen examples of projects, primarily in Noe Valley that have led to an average increase in sales price of $3.5 to $5 million dollars after the completion of the work allowed under the alteration permit. Granted this is a snapshot of about 50 projects…none of which came before the Commission in a DR and with a few exceptions were all spec projects.
Based on the two percentages in the first paragraph of this memo at least one-third should have been reviewed by the Commission and Staff as demolitions.....and that is under the Demo Calcs that are the same values as approved in 2007 and have never, ever been adjusted since Section 317 was added to the Planning Code.

Many projects have “squishy” Demo Calcs that are close to triggering Tantamount to Demolition. Many projects have Demo Calcs that have needed to be adjusted mid-construction and that are still “squishy”.

Many projects cannot be assessed because your Enforcement Staff has limited tools for penalties or for the ability to access a project. Enforcement should be upgraded with increased penalty fees but the Commission needs to work with the Supervisors and the Mayor to improve and upgrade Section 176.

However the Commission has the ability to use their own power, at any time to adjust the Demo Calcs per the Planning Code and to better comply with the General Plan so that when a project comes into the Department it can be fully analyzed as to whether it is a demo or not.

Following along with the adjustments made in the RH-1 value, and the policies as written in the 2014 Housing Element of the General Plan it seems reasonable to wish that the Demo Calcs had been adjusted if not four times at least once these past five years. This seems even more necessary now that the proposed Demo legislation, like the RET previously has apparently been discarded.
July 16, 2021

Re: Housing Element 2022 Update EIR

Honorable Commissioners:

Despite coinciding with the Independence Day holiday weekend and the "post-pandemic" reopening as well as providing only a 10-day commentary period, the EIR for the 2022 Housing Element did not quite slip by the eyes of all San Franciscans.

The board of directors of Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association (GGVNA), founded 1976, read it, discussed it, and wondered why there wasn't more outcry over proposals that, carried to their logical conclusion, would alter San Francisco beyond recognition.

Please, before you toss this down with an epithet, realize that despite its location in Cow Hollow, at the time GGVNA was founded, it was considered more or less of a "stepsister" of its far more affluent neighboring associations. That property values rose may, perhaps, be somewhat credited to residents' middle class values, but mostly to outside forces. GGVNA doesn't expect younger folks to know this history or realize we're not just one big enclave of conservatives, but rather for the most part accidental, if fortunate, heirs to demographic changes over the past few decades.
The 2022 Housing Element EIR sounds more like groundwork for a coup than the previous ones we've perused since the ‘90s.

One doesn't have to be reactionary to wish SF, like most great cities that continue to deserve that modifier, would keep its variety of architectural styles, from grand to petite Victorians, Queen Annes, and Edwardians forward to today's expressions. **Retenementing**, however, will recreate some of the country's worst living conditions while modifying or eliminating private property as it has been defined here—especially in light of as yet unexamined claims of thousands of available spaces "out there." It will also set the stage to demolish historic residential zoning such as height limits, backyards, spacing, privacy, and even the "peaceful enjoyment" our city's documents so often mention.

Using vague terms like "transit corridors," planning documents may not cause folks to take out their city maps and therefore many may not notice that in SF these convenient corridors could easily cover almost the entire city.

Many of us have been environmentalists for decades. We never defined our beliefs and support as using a hatchet where a carving knife might be more appropriate.

We wonder how many artists, nonconformists, or tourists would continue to flock to San Francisco should it become a crowded, airless, gardenless, architectureless, charmless, mostly viewless location, still dotted with those unfortunates who cannot tolerate the minimal confinement or rules of affordable housing and prefer the perceived freedom of the streets.
Until the entire Bay Area, working with mental health practitioners, can begin for find ways to help addicts become content former addicts, sociopaths and psychopaths a way or place to fit in, there will remain street people, the preponderance where the weather is temperate. It will certainly take cooperation with the federal government to try to help victims of the above-mentioned diseases and the realization of all Americans that these are their family members who fled be it discrimination or bad weather to congregate in massive numbers where acceptance is greater and weather is kinder. (Yes, we know about surveys saying SF’s homeless are from SF, but we wonder how many of those are (a) verified or (b) asked for how long.)

Sincerely yours,

Phil Faroudja, GGVNA President
Serena Bardell, GGVNA Vice President
FW: Upzone more of District 2 for Housing Element

CPC.HousingElementUpdateEIR <CPC.HousingElementUpdateEIR@sfgov.org>

Mon 6/21/2021 7:50 AM
To: Haddadan, Kimia (CPC) <kimia.haddadan@sfgov.org>; Caltagirone, Shelley (CPC) <shelley.caltagirone@sfgov.org>; Leon-Farrera, Malena (CPC) <malena.leon-farrera@sfgov.org>

Hi Kimia, Shelley, and Malena,

Below is an email from Scot Conner commenting on the Housing Element NOP. The comments seem to be more about the Housing Element plans and policies so I’m forwarding this email.

Thank you,
Liz

From: Scot Conner <scot.conner@berkeley.edu>
Sent: Saturday, June 19, 2021 7:23 AM
To: CPC.HousingElementUpdateEIR <CPC.HousingElementUpdateEIR@sfgov.org>
Subject: Upzone more of District 2 for Housing Element

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Elizabeth White,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide written comment on SF’s 2022 Housing Element Update. I’m a renter and a resident of District 2. I will not be able to attend the live feedback meeting, so I’m writing to provide my comments on SF’s Housing Element Plan.

Overall, I’m so excited by this plan. SF must build far more homes in the North and West sides of the City because those areas are the highest resource and therefore, at the least risk of displacement and gentrification. However, I do not think this plan goes far enough in upzoning transit corridors in District 2 (specifically Pacific Heights, the Marina, Cow Hollow and Presidio Heights).

Those D2 neighborhoods are wealthier and more highly resourced than the West side, but only Lombard St is identified as a transit corridor subject to modest mid rise up-zoning in the preliminary maps provided. SF should include Union and Chestnut streets west of Van Ness as transit corridors because of the ample bus service provided on those streets by the 30 and 45 Muni lines. SF Planning should also include California St (west of Van Ness) as a transit corridor since it is well served by the 1-California and runs through the very wealthy areas of Pac Heights and Presidio Heights. All of these areas are extremely walkable with some of the best access to parks and the waterfront in the City (e.g. Ft Mason, Crissy Field, Presidio, Lafayette Park, Atla Plaza, etc.). We need to concentrate more development in the Marina, Cow Hollow and Pac Heights.

Moreover, these D2 transit corridors should be upzoned to a higher level than the general midrise heights proposed for transit corridors (and certainly higher than the embarrassing current 40 ft height limits). SF should zone for Parisian style 10-12 story buildings along these corridors because these areas are wealthier than the west side transit corridors and have closer proximity to downtown. Design standards tailored to the character of each area can be implemented. We can have good design and density that respects the feel of neighborhoods, the only sacrifice is height which should no longer be a legitimate policy goal of SF since we know that the most effective way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate climate change is to build urban infill housing (i.e. make it easy for people to decarbonize their lifestyles). Every time SF limits the height of buildings, we force people to live.
in suburbs or exurbs or areas at risk of wildfire and drive cars in their commutes and daily lives that further worsen climate change.

10-12 story heights actually fit with the historical character of these neighborhoods. If you walk around the area just north and a bit west of Lafayette Park you will find dozens of beautiful 8-10 story buildings of dense apartments. It’s pretty crazy those buildings were legal to build 100 years ago, but today are illegal to build (with the 40 ft height limits and strict density controls).

It cannot be a legitimate or equitable policy goal of the SF Planning Department to protect the views of rich people’s Pacific Heights mansions. Let’s make D2 more like Paris or Barcelona and zone for 10-12 story residential buildings that will make these neighborhoods incredibly lively, walkable, encourage low carbon lifestyles and ease displacement pressures on communities of color in the Mission and SOMA.

Also, there should be a higher upzoning for the Van Ness corridor to maximize the city’s investment in time, money, and years of construction for Van Ness BRT. SF Planning should extend the "Hub" style zoning from Market St to the Bay along the new BRT corridor and allow 400 ft buildings to be built there. We need to fully take advantage of SF’s most advanced transit corridor after Market St and zone for 40 story buildings here rather than the current zoning which at most allows for 130 ft in some places. If we want to decarbonize SF we need to maximize housing along robust transit corridors like Van Ness and allowing a massive abundance of new homes to flood the market by building 400 ft tall buildings on this corridor will help stabilize housing costs throughout the City.

Finally, SF should remove building height restrictions for residential buildings downtown. There are so many lots downtown that are either parking lots or parking garages that will become obsolete in a future decarbonized SF. Also, as widespread remote work changes commuting patterns, downtown needs to build more tall residential towers to add enough daytime and non-commuting population that can support the businesses that rely on commuters who live in other parts of the Bay Area. Removing the height limits on parking lots and garages would not only encourage decarbonized lifestyles but would also better incentivize proposals to maximize housing in transit rich and walkable areas that will help keep downtown lively as remote work decreases the daily commuting population.

SF needs to be building far more housing of all kinds (market rate and affordable). Due to our inclusionary zoning requirements, allowing more market rate housing will build more affordable housing at no public cost. We will most effectively affirmatively further fair housing by upzoning SF’s richest neighborhoods in District 2 - Pacific Heights, the Marina, Cow Hollow and Presidio Heights.

Thank you,

Scot Conner
September 27th, 2021

Kimia Haddadan
Shelley Caltagirone
Malena Leon-Farrera
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Ave, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA
94103

Dear Housing Element Team,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Housing Element 2022 Update. We are pleased to see this important document take shape. SPUR’s mission is to create an equitable, sustainable and prosperous region. Our comments are intended to further these objectives. While we are supportive of the direction that the Department is taking in this draft, we have several comments, questions and concerns, which we outline below:

1. **We support the manner in which the draft centers racial equity.**
   As the draft makes clear, the scarcity of housing is an economic problem, but one which disproportionately impacts American Indian, Black and other Communities of Color. By centering the experiences of these communities, the housing element can focus on policies that achieve more equitable outcomes.

2. **We appreciate the ways in which the Planning Department is engaging a wider range of stakeholders through direct outreach and through new ways of presenting materials.**
   The Department is committed to doing extensive outreach to American Indian, Black and other Communities of Color, as well as other groups it has not reached as well in prior Housing Element cycles. Moreover, the Department has provided materials in a more user-friendly manner, through videos, digital storytelling and other mechanisms that make the Housing Element more accessible to a broader group of people than in past cycles.

3. **We support the goal of planning for half the city’s growth in High Opportunity Neighborhoods as a means to affirmatively further fair housing, but we have questions about how that goal will be achieved.**
   In order to further racial equity and housing affordability goals, the Department is committing to plan for roughly half of the 83,000 units San Francisco needs to accommodate in the next RHNA cycle to be built in High Opportunity Neighborhoods (policy III.5). There are many benefits to this approach. It provides more equitable
outcomes by creating housing opportunities in higher wealth neighborhoods, it allows for infill development in communities that have previously not accepted much growth.

However, such planning must be realistic, and take into account the likelihood of site redevelopment given 1) the limited number of multi-unit redevelopment sites, 2) the political challenges housing sponsors will face, and 3) the high cost of land. Specifically, we are concerned that there may be insufficient site inventory to realistically allow for the development of 40,000+ units on the west side, particularly sites that provide enough scale for feasible redevelopment and sites that are underdeveloped enough to support alternative use at feasible land valuation. In order to support multifamily affordable housing, sites should support 40 units at a minimum, and preferably more; and in order to support multifamily mixed income housing, sites should support 20 units at a minimum, and preferably more. We also are concerned about challenges that affordable housing developments may face securing entitlements on the west side, which has been less friendly to growth. Additionally, it will be important to ensure that affordable housing developments in high opportunity areas will close enough to transit to compete well for state funding. We look forward to reviewing the site inventory analysis as it relates to this policy recommendation.

4. **We are concerned that if rezoning is limited in Priority Geographies that it will be challenging to meet the need for the other 50% of housing units that are not accommodated in high opportunity areas.**

Policy III.5 includes a policy to limit rezoning within Priority Geographies to the specific needs of American Indian, Black and other Communities of Color. Policy III.1 seeks to target affordable housing funding to support the creation of 50% of the affordable housing RHNA allocation within Priority Geographies.

At minimum it would be helpful to clarify A. if the rezoning contemplated within Priority Geographies under policy 111.5 are those that would predominantly support the creation of affordable housing and if so, B. where the Department will be zoning for the market rate and mixed income housing that is not accommodated either in Areas of Opportunity or in Priority Geographies. The challenge for 100% affordable housing developments is primarily fiscal, and limiting mixed income housing will not address the fiscal challenge.

It will also be helpful to clarify what is meant by the policy to limit rezoning to the specific needs of American Indian, Black and other Communities of Color. Limiting housing production in San Francisco has negative disproportionate impacts on low income people of color because it drives up the cost of available housing by limiting supply. It may be better to concentrate on policies that stabilize American Indian, Black and other Communities of Color in existing housing, while also seeking to add more housing (which, per the city’s inclusionary requirement, includes affordable units or pays
an in lieu fee). Policy III.3 to prioritize the City’s acquisition and rehabilitation program in priority geographies is perhaps a better policy to prioritize to achieve this policy goal.

Lastly, Policy III.1 recommends increasing inclusionary requirements in priority geographies. It is very important that inclusionary requirements not be increased beyond levels of financial feasibility. Some of the area plans on the east side already have high inclusionary housing requirements, increasing them still further without increasing density further could have a potential chilling impact on housing development in these areas.

5. **We encourage the department to find ways to elevate environmental sustainability in the draft, particularly by encouraging new housing construction near transit.**

Policy III.6 describes how new housing should be placed near transit in high opportunity areas, which we support. We would recommend finding ways to place new housing near transit in other city neighborhoods as well.

6. **We are concerned that new housing is sometimes referred to in the draft as a “burden” rather than an asset to San Francisco.**

Policy III.5 refers to “reducing the burden of new housing” to advocate for limiting new housing construction in priority geographies. While we understand that new housing construction does result in more people living in a community and therefore a greater demand for services, it is also a net asset for the city as a whole, enabling the city to address the chronic housing shortage. It also can be an asset to these neighborhoods as well. It would be helpful to ensure that new housing is not characterized in a negative light when it is necessary for achieving so many of the city’s goals.

7. **We are pleased to see the department include policies and actions that reduce the cost of producing new housing and therefore increase the likelihood that new housing will be built and would like to see that language strengthened.**

Policy IV.3 seeks to reduce development constraints such as high construction cost and lengthy City-permitting timelines to increase housing choices and improve affordability. Given the challenges of producing housing in San Francisco, we are pleased to see this goal included in the housing element.

Policy V.4, however, includes language that limits permit streamlining to projects that maximize the number of below market rate units under state density bonus law. We believe that streamlining should be a goal for all housing projects, particularly since significant impact fees are already exacted through the inclusionary requirement, the TSF, as well as child-care, school fees, and infrastructure impact fees. While the housing element draft includes a policy focused on ensuring the feasibility of the inclusionary housing requirement, it would be helpful if the city examines the impact on housing production associated with the full fee stack imposed on a unit.
8. The housing element should emphasize a more aggressive approach to using surplus public sites for housing.

Policy III.1 supports using publicly-owned underutilized sites for housing needs and policy IV.5 also discusses how public sites should be used to support new housing production. The Housing Element should emphasize an even more aggressive approach to using surplus public sites for housing. For example, the city should examine the huge amount of land dedicated to suburban type roadways on the West Side, including Sunset Boulevard (an entire block wide running from Golden Gate Park to Sloat that contains six underutilized lanes of traffic). Those blocks could be redeveloped with mid-rise housing with a high percentage of affordable housing with infrastructure already in place.

9. We encourage the department to review draft goals, policies and actions with an eye towards feasibility of implementation.

This draft of the housing element puts forward many policies with laudable goals but high costs. We do feel it will be important to prioritize policies for inclusion in the final document, taking into account that some polices are very expensive to implement and therefore are unlikely to occur without additional subsidy. Otherwise we are concerned that it will be challenging to actually implement the housing element and may leave some stakeholders feeling like they were promised certain policies that are unlikely to actually be implemented.

10. We encourage the city to analyze the capacity of sites under current zoning by taking into account the historic housing yield on existing sites.

While a site analysis has not been yet released to the public, we are very interested to see how the city will assess the capacity of sites under current zoning. We hope that the city will look at how many sites contemplated under the last housing element were actually developed. As you may know, Los Angeles has been pioneering a new model for assessing site capacity\(^1\), which may be beneficial for San Francisco to review.

Thank you for considering our comments. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at skarlinsky@spur.org

Sincerely,

Sarah Karlinsky
Senior Advisor

---

\(^1\) [https://ternercenter.berkeley.edu/research-and-policy/stronger-housing-element-los-angeles/]
25 May 2021

Planning Commission President, Joel Koppel
Planning Commissioners Kathrin Moore (Vice-President), Deland Chan, Sue Diamond, Frank Fung, Theresa Imperial, Rachael Tanner

Re: The following items from the April 22, 2021 Planning Commission hearing
Housing Element (Item # 2019-016230CWP)
Housing Balance and Housing Inventory (Item # 2018-004047CWP-02)

Dear Planning Commission President Koppel and Planning Commissioners Moore, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, and Tanner:

Please accept these comments from the Race and Equity in all Planning Coalition on the three housing policy items referenced above that the Planning Commission heard on April 22, 2021. The comments on the Housing Element are a summary of our main points. We are submitting a more complete set of comments through the online portal that Planning staff has created for receiving comments. Since the online portal does not accept complete comments to the Housing Element, we will also be submitting a full set of our comments to the Housing Element draft strategies in a separate letter.

General Comments to the Process

1. This Housing Element is being billed as the first in San Francisco's history to center racial and social equity; however the substantive policies and strategies that Planning has presented replicate the same housing systems and structures that continue to overproduce luxury housing, which is largely inaccessible to working class, low income and marginalized communities and communities of color, and underproduce housing that is affordable to these communities.

2. The Housing Inventory, Housing Balance Reports 11 and 12, and Update on Monitoring Reports memo to Planning Commission is dated April 16, only 6 days prior to the April 22 hearing date. This is a 154 page document. There is no realistic way for the public to review, digest, and comment in such a short amount of time.

3. Not providing the public with information with sufficient time to review and comment leaves impacted communities out of these conversations, and perpetuates structural inequities and abuses on vulnerable communities.

4. The Housing Inventory reports are chronically late. For example, Report #11 is 6 months late. This decreases the ability of the public to have access to current data - and to be able to respond to it in a timely way.

Housing Inventory

1. Counting all accessory dwelling units as "affordable" units is not supportable since landlords can charge whatever they please for these units. They will in certain circumstances be subject to San Francisco's rent stabilization program, but when initially
rented, and when tenancies change, landlords are able to charge whatever rents they want - unhindered by any price controls that would ensure affordability.

2. Why are rehabilitated units counted as "new affordable units built" when reporting in this way is both false and misleading? If rehabilitated affordable units are counted as "new", then the same should be true of market rate units, and the housing balance should then be recalculated to reflect criteria applied consistently to both sides of the "balance" equation.

3. Please take note of the remark in the Housing Inventory that "the majority of new housing development in 2020 occurred in the South of Market and Mission Planning Districts". The Inventory also notes that these are two of the areas of the city facing the greatest escalation of housing costs and displacement of existing residents. This is precisely the reason why communities are fighting back against efforts to expedite more market rate housing. It causes gentrification and displacement of BIPOC and low income communities.

4. The Housing Inventory does not include any mention of the voters' overwhelming support for new social housing, a strategy that will assist the City to implement the goal of race and social equity. It also does not identify any land use strategies for making new social housing possible. There is also no discussion about the unmet need for affordable housing and the urgency to prioritize policies and land use strategies for meeting this desperate need.

5. The RHNA report on p. 15 shows clearly that "above moderate" housing production is far in excess of the goals- but this is only reported as 100% rather than showing the true number which should be 148%. This is an example of Planning's obfuscation of the impacts of its policies to prejudice in favor of market rate housing production and hinders community ability to provide input by providing incomplete or inaccurate information.

6. The number of units "demolished" is extremely high. And, the column "units gained or lost from alteration" is confusing. What does this mean? How do you add both "gained" and "lost" together into one number? Is a positive number indicating more units gained or lost?

7. We don't see any discussion of the number of units entitled by Planning that have not been built- and the number of units entitled by Planning that have not even applied for building permits.

8. There is a list of entitled projects that are to be pursued on a phased basis, but Parkmerced is not listed as one of those projects. What is the status of Parkmerced which received its entitlements a decade ago? What is the schedule for rescission of those entitlements, and re-application required?

9. The Intermediate Length Occupancy (ILO) restrictions legislation passed at the Board of Supervisors in 2020- but this legislation is not mentioned in the report. There also is no report about the impact of ILOs on SF's housing stock - or efforts to implement the enforcement provisions.

10. There is also no mention in the Inventory about Short Term Rentals (STR), permitting or enforcement that happened in 2020, geographic distribution and pricing of these units, and the impact STRs are having on San Francisco's housing market.
11. Similarly there is no mention of the use of "Shelter In Place Hotels" during 2020, or of a land use plan for ensuring permanent housing for those who are currently un-housed. A complete Housing Inventory would make mention of the resources secured by Proposition C that passed, and discuss a land use plan for implementation. These are concrete strategies that will assist the City to achieve the goal of racial and social equity.

Housing Balance Report Nos 11 & 12
1. Report 11 is six months late. We hope that Planning will commit to timely updates to the Housing Balance so the Board of Supervisors and the public have this essential information when making important policy and land use decisions.
2. Since the ballot measure was approved by the voters, Planning has never produced a complete and accurate Housing Balance report. The full intent of the underlying ordinance reads "More than 50% of this housing would be affordable for middle class households with at least 33% affordable for low and moderate income households, and the City is expected to develop strategies to achieve that goal."
3. Where is the part of the report showing progress toward the 50% that are supposed to be affordable for middle class households?" (see p. 3)
4. Where is the part of the report that details the "strategies to achieve that goal"?
5. This report should include an interdepartmental strategy for getting every one of the Housing Balance numbers (for every District) up to +50%. This is required by the ordinance. Those strategies should be created by vulnerable communities, and there should be a detailed report as to how the City is implementing those strategies and ensuring that the City's housing balance achieves +50% in every part of the City. This should at least include a prohibition on demolitions, and a focused land use and resource strategy for affordable housing. Again, these are concrete strategies that will assist the City to achieve the goal of racial and social equity.

Housing Element
As requested by Planning, REP is submitting our full and detailed comments to the Housing Element "draft goals, policies and actions" through Planning's "Online Participation Platform" and in complete form in a separate letter since the online platform only allows for summary comments. This is a summary of our comments.

Unfortunately we have to refer back to the flawed way that the Housing Element process started. Planning spent the first two years of its Housing Element process exploring what it identified as the fundamental question it sought to answer:

- "What would it take to achieve the City's targets of 5,000 units per year with at least ⅓ affordable and increased community stability over the next 30 years?"

From the outset, Planning was setting this entire multi-year process on a course for 67% market rate and 33% affordable housing after decades of the market producing at least this imbalance of market rate to affordable housing which has resulted in the displacement of communities of color and low income people from San Francisco.
This fundamental question comes from Planning's Housing Affordability Strategies (HAS) report. This HAS report is entirely about building 150,000 new housing units and a trickle down model of relying on market rate, for-profit housing creating affordability. As Equity Director Miriam Chion says in her April, 2020 presentation of the HAS, "This report provides the analysis for our city's housing recovery efforts as well as our long term housing plan and strategies." Planner James Pappas presents a slide that says that this "Analysis and outreach will inform [the] 2022 Housing Element, Housing policy implementation, Neighborhood level planning."

If the focus of the city's housing policies was truly "Racial and Social Equity" then the Housing Element process should be answering questions from the communities that have been most impacted by Planning's previous policies. Unfortunately, the process for updating policies starts instead with questions about how Planning can take care of developers. If the starting point for this process had come from impacted communities, the questions asked would have been rooted in how the REP Coalition has defined Equity.

We are also extremely concerned that the online system for collecting community feedback on the draft policies and strategies includes strict character limits and utilizes binary "voting" with thumbs up or down. Moreover, most of the policies and strategies are so confusing that the votes become meaningless and the comments truncated to the point of being only marginally useful or open to wide interpretation. The entire process feels rigged and directed toward Planning's justification of streamlining for-profit development while sprinkling the process with empty apologies and references to guilt for past practices.

1. The format for gathering input does not appear to elicit meaningful feedback. First, you have to give a "thumb up" or "thumb down" to what seems like an endless list of recommendations; some of which read like policy recommendations; some which read like value statements; some which read like aspirational or motivational statements. How, for instance are you supposed to give a thumb "up" or "down" to a statement that reads "Support affordable housing by providing small-scale landlords with subsidy for unpaid rent during rent increase and eviction moratoriums"? REP Coalition organizations support affordable housing- but we are not familiar with any small-scale landlords that provide affordable housing. We are also not familiar with tenants who would want to provide their landlord with a subsidy if that tenant isn't able to pay their rent. Most tenants want to have sufficient income to pay their rent, which is why supplemental or emergency income programs are so important in times of emergency. So, how is someone supposed to rate this- with a thumb up for supporting affordable housing? Or a thumb down for giving landlords money to protect their profits while tenants are left vulnerable and scared?

2. If you're able to get past this strange rating system for the policy statements, you then click through to a comment form where you then have to rate the sum total of all these policy statements under the title of the policy itself. After you've grappled with each of these confusinglyworded policy statements, it's difficult to figure out if you "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree" with the overriding policy proposition? Some might look ok-others might seem strange or confusing. So, for each one, do you just put "neutral"?
3. Ultimately, Planning will have compiled a collection of thumbs and "agree" or "disagree" markings. It is unclear what the outcome of these ratings will be. If something gets a bunch of thumbs up, will it move on to the next round? Or a few "strongly disagree" marks will get dropped out? How does this process reconcile any contradictions or inconsistencies as described above? Will any of the feedback or comments provided be incorporated into new policy recommendations not already contemplated in the current proposal?

The most essential question the REP Coalition is faced with is, how do the voices of vulnerable communities- that have been impacted by the decades of housing elements and housing policies- and will be disproportionately impacted by this new Housing Element- come to the forefront and lead the creation and implementation of these policies?

This is the overview of our critique and comments to the Housing Element along with the totality of our comments to the Housing Inventory and Housing Balance reports. We are still in the process of uploading all of our detailed comments to the Housing Element into Planning's very lengthy online form. We will also submit a separate and rather long letter with all of our detailed critiques to the Housing Element policy statements. Unfortunately Planning's form character limits do not allow for all of our comments to be uploaded. We also want to be sure Planning is able to track the REP Coalition comments as separate and distinct so we can continue our dialog with Planning on these very important policy proposals.

We look forward to hearing back from you with responses to the questions and concerns we have described in this letter.

Respectfully,

The Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition

cc: Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department
    Miriam Chion, Equity Director, Planning Department
    SF Board of Supervisors
8 June 2021

Miriam Chion, Community Equity Director
San Francisco Planning Department

Dear Miriam,

Please accept this letter from the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition which details all of our comments and feedback to the Draft Goals of the Housing Element 2022 update.

Compiling these comments has taken a large scale coordinated effort among the REP Coalition organizations. Since Planning’s online form squeezes comment and feedback into a set of binary indications of thumbs either up or down; categorically simplified rankings from "Strongly Agree" to "Neutral" and "Strongly Disagree"; and narrative feedback strictly constrained by character limits which disallows the comments to address nuance or complexity, we felt that it was important to provide our comprehensive feedback in this format.

Thank you for considering the community’s full equity perspective as expressed in this letter. We look forward to continuing our dialog with Planning on these very important policy proposals relating to the Housing Element 2022 update.

Respectfully,

The Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition

cc: Rich Hillis, Planning Director
Planning Commission
Board of Supervisors
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1. **POLICY #1: Recognize the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic stability**

**Policy 1.1 Expand permanently supportive housing and services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness**

1. The notion that private developers will satisfy their inclusionary requirements by providing permanent supportive housing is misguided. Developers don’t like providing BMR units to begin with- and when they do, they push the AMI levels as high as possible.

2. There needs to be a land use plan that ensures that Planning is working collaboratively with other city departments to identify sites- both publicly and privately owned- for new permanent supportive housing that will be developed, owned and managed by San Francisco-based, nonprofit supportive housing providers.

**Policy 1.2 Increase shelters and temporary housing in proportion to permanent solutions, including necessary services for unhoused populations**

1. Need to prioritize land and funding resources for permanent, supportive housing. Navigation centers are not a permanent solution, nor are Safe Parking sites. While Navigation centers and Safe Parking sites might be important short term resources, these should not be priorities especially for a long term land use and housing plan.

**Policy 1.3 Affirmatively address the racial and social disparities among people experiencing homelessness by ensuring equitable access to shelter or housing...**

1. The “priority geographies” are unclear and have not been vetted- how were they arrived at (in 2016)- what criteria were used? REP Coalition organizations are unfamiliar with these “priority geographies,” so we are not ready to accept these as a criterion for prioritization of resources.

**Policy 1.4 Prevent homelessness for people at risk of becoming unhoused...**

1. The “priority geographies” are unclear and have not been vetted- how were they arrived at (in 2016)- what criteria were used?

2. Why are the criteria not updated per COVID and the vulnerabilities presented from COVID health issues and loss of income?

3. Where does the number 5,000 come from - “develop a regional homelessness prevention approach to prevent 5,000 households from becoming homeless in San Francisco”? This seems incredibly low.

4. What is this “regional” approach to homelessness prevention? Is there any additional information about this so we can evaluate it further, or have input?

**Policy 1.5 Prevent eviction of residents of subsidized housing or SROs**

1. Expanding case management services and removing barriers to housing stability such as assigned counselors regardless of where the resident lives are positive steps that need to be taken. However, many of the case managers and other support services are not provided with adequate funding or training and have unsustainably high caseloads all of which cause high turnover for these positions. These systemic deficiencies cause instability for residents regardless of the program design.
2. The housing retention requirements for non-profit providers are already fairly high on paper. The issue is enforcing and implementing them in a meaningful way so tenancies are actually maintained.

**Policy 1.6 Elevate direct rental assistance as a primary strategy to secure housing stability and reduce rent burden.**

1. Rental assistance is great but should not be a "primary strategy" for housing stability or for reducing rent burden. Rental assistance is primarily a way to subsidize landlords' profits.
2. This section doesn't seem to acknowledge COVID. The economic impacts on tenants - obligations for past and current rent obligations- will be with us for some time. Seems like this should be a priority.
3. What are the funding strategies for expanding these rental assistance programs?
4. Is this strategy really sustainable? It seems like this just supports the market. We need real, affordable housing where tenants are not vulnerable to eviction and speculation.

**Policy 1.7 Preserve affordability of existing subsidized housing, gov’t or coop owned housing where affordability req's are expiring.**

1. Unclear what "use RAD models" means here. What about that model would help to preserve affordability? Bring in Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs)? That seems unacceptable as it represents a privatization of public housing, the inclusion of private equity, and all the affordability and management problems that LIHTCs present.
2. We should instead be encouraging the increased public investment in affordable housing.
3. We should be investing in expansion of limited equity cooperative housing models.
4. We need a clear strategy for how the city will affirmatively seek to create additional subsidized, gov’t, and coop housing when affordability requirements are expiring.

**Policy 1.8 Preserve remaining affordable SROs**

1. Increasing fines for illegal conversions seems weak. We need to further define what illegal conversions are- for instance expand the definition of Intermediate Length Occupancies (ILOs) and tighten up the definition of Short Term Rentals (STRs), put a tighter cap on both, and expand our enforcement of both with real investment and proactive enforcement.
2. We should also not be prioritizing master leasing. It’s a much better investment to purchase SROs to be owned by nonprofits rather than paying master leases to for-profit owners that have no long term commitment to affordable, stable housing for low income tenants.

**Policy 1.9 Minimize evictions for no-fault and at-fault**

1. Require a public "change of use" hearing at Planning Commission for all Ellis Act filings so public comment can be heard. No action can be taken because of State preemption, but at least there would be a public disclosure of who is being evicted and why.
2. Fully fund the tenant right to counsel program and prioritize ALL tenants, not just "Vulnerable Groups".
3. Ellis Act reform should be a priority, but the minimum holding period of five years should not be what we're striving for. If a landlord wants to go out of business, they should sell the apartment building to someone who wants to continue that building in operation as an apartment building. It doesn't make sense that tenants should be kicked out of a building so a landlord can make more money by selling off the units as TIC's. If they want to pursue a different business model, they should sell the apartment building and go pursue a different business model at a different location.

4. Costa-Hawkins reform should be a priority, but why extend rent control to 25 years old buildings? Why not 15? It should be extended to the most recent allowable under law (ref AB1482).

**Policy 1.10** Eliminate discrimination and advance equal housing access based on race, ethnicity...

1. There needs to be a commitment to increased resources for enforcement of equitable housing access.

**Policy 1.11 Improve access to BMR units**

1. Housing counseling and readiness will not significantly increase the number of BIPOC who are accepted to BMR units. There aren't very many units, and the rents and purchase prices are too high. Price and availability are the most significant barriers. BMR units are important as a strategy to compel for-profit developers to provide a community benefit, but BMR units are not in any way a significant component of an affordable housing strategy or an equity strategy.

2. One critical strategy that's missing from this section is to figure out a legislative strategy for decreasing HOA fees. We know that this is an issue at the State level, but this means that Planning should work with the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor's office and the City Attorney on a political and legal strategy for decreasing HOA fees, otherwise BMR ownership units will continue to be a farce.

3. Planning staff needs to encourage developers to provide BMR units on-site and not fee-out or defer to off-site units.

4. Increasing neighborhood preference doesn't necessarily make sense given that the trigger for BMR's is a market rate development of at least 10 units. Because the threshold is so high, and much of the development in lower density neighborhoods and zoning areas is less than 10 units, residents in these parts of the city who need BMR housing would never have a chance of getting in.

5. There shouldn't be an expansion of the Senior Operating Subsidy to provide public subsidies to developers. These units should be priced at lower levels so extremely low and very low income seniors can actually afford them.

6. Planning should work with the Board of Supervisors to increase the inclusionary requirements for projects that take either the State or Local density bonus, and make sure that these BMR units which should be on-site are targeted to low and very low income households. AMI levels for BMR units should also be significantly lowered to meet the primary demand and need for these units.

7. There needs to be a stronger standard to ensure that the future residents reflect the demographics of the surrounding area. There are countless examples of how the cities' lottery process fails local working class communities and communities of
color, those most in need, and yet often last in line, to benefit from these new developments. Therefore, the Housing Element should establish a racial equity metric in the lottery process.

**Policy 1.12** During emergencies, allow for emergent policies that address housing insecurity and economic hardship

1. The goal “Support affordable housing by providing small-scale landlords with subsidy for unpaid rent” is confusing. Providing small landlords with financial support in order to address their economic insecurity caused by decreased rent revenues is important—**in exchange for rent relief and an eviction moratorium**—but it’s very important to note that this is NOT affordable housing.
2. Instead of focusing resources on emergency shelter, we need to be providing permanent, supportive housing for all.
3. There should also be a delay on any substantial rehab requests that would cause tenants to be relocated for any significant duration.
4. There should be immediately available affordable housing for tenants that are displaced as a result of habitability violations and fires to no fault of their own. Landlords should be held accountable to address violations and habitability issues so tenants can be housed in a stable and healthy manner.
5. No need to continue to prioritize permits for new market rate housing. All prioritization should be on land use strategies that create greater stability and affordability.

**RETURN TO THE TOP**

2. **POLICY #2: Repair the harms of historic racial, ethnic, social discrimination for American Indian, Black and other People of Color.**

**Policy II.1: Reframe the narrative of housing challenges to acknowledge and understand the discrimination against Communities of Color as a root cause for disparate outcomes.**

1. This all sounds good but the level of confidence in this reframed narrative cannot be very high when the new narrative originates from the creators of the old. This perspective must come from those communities that have been harmed by governmental abuse.

**Policy II.2: Embrace the guidance of community leaders representing American Indian, Black, and other People of Color throughout the planning and implementation of housing solutions.**

1. What does this actually mean? Who gets to decide who community leaders are? This is meaningless unless this is a commitment to a process that allows communities to be empowered to determine who their ‘leaders’ are. The guidance that is provided must be a legitimate representation of the interests of that community. We have seen too many instances of the City making the determination of who represents a community, and what results is a coincidental alignment with plans that serve developer (not community) interests.
2. Budget allocations to city departments and agencies that support implementation of an equity framework will be suspect unless coming from the city’s general fund and not from fees derived from developers. The fact that Planning’s staff capacity is funded from fees paid by developers creates an inherent conflict of interest that drives the creation of profit incentives to facilitate revenue generation.

3. We question the legitimacy of appointed advisory bodies that have not been subject to vetting by the community. REP organizations have deep roots in our respective communities and are authentic voices among others to represent the city’s underserved populations.

Policy II.3: Amplify and prioritize voices of American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in the City’s engagement processes

1. Who gets to determine the voices that are heard? Our voices are not empowered if our communities do not get to determine who speaks for us, and how our input will be used. We have seen how surveys and focus groups and funded partnerships have been utilized by Planning to make it seem as though they are listening to the community. We have seen how only select people are allowed entry into these discussions and how voices may be listened to but not actually heard.

2. The REP coalition has gone to great lengths to include all our various communities and all the stakeholders that are concerned with equity in planning and we are uniquely positioned to represent our own interests. Having a parallel process of seeking representative voices that is carried out by Planning raises serious questions about whether Planning is truly interested in equity or more concerned with a process that they can control.

Policy II.4: Measure racial and social equity in each step of the planning process for housing to assess and pursue ways to achieve beneficial outcomes for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color.

1. This should be a given but it does relate to oversight of the planning process. This oversight is not defined here but should be the primary means of ensuring accountability to this endeavor, and therefore, the most important aspect of a race and equity policy. If the task of determining milestones and assessing performance is at the discretion of Planning then we are not changing any of the practices that have historically harmed our communities. If Planning’s measuring stick is incremented by microns while ours is incremented by meters, then we have incompatibly different perspectives on outcomes.

Policy II.5: Bring back People of Color displaced from the city by strengthening racial and cultural anchors and increasing housing opportunities in support of building wealth.

1. The REP coalition supports these policy statements, but the measures of achievement must be subject to scrutiny by our collective communities. We should be able to assess whether these policies are being carried out in a way that sufficiently redresses the historic harm that has been done.
Policy II.6: Prioritize health improvement investments within Environmental Justice Communities to ensure that housing reduces existing health disparities.

1. Culturally competent outreach is important, but there also must be a process where impacted communities have the ability to determine how remediation is conducted, and enforcement that is accountable and responsive to impacted communities.

3. POLICY #3: Foster racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through distinct community strategies

Policy III.1: Eliminate community displacement of American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in Priority Geographies.

- “Dedicate a minimum budget for permanently affordable housing in priority geographies within the 10-year Capital Planning to support funding for planned affordable housing in these areas and with a goal of 50% of RHNA permanently affordable housing targets within the next two cycles (by 2038) in priority geographies.”
  - Comments:
    - The term Priority Geographies is a term that is “imposed” and has not been thoroughly vetted. It assumes that it includes all and is agreed upon by vulnerable communities.
  - Specific Questions:
    - Has the community signed off on these priority geographies? What communities and neighborhoods are missing? Why is eliminating displacement limited to priority geographies? How will vulnerable pockets of people outside of priority geographies be protected? Example: Half of the Latino Cultural District is not even covered. Chinatown? Westside?
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
    - Where geographic lines are drawn, it must be a transparent process that centers equity with vulnerable communities at the decision-making table
    - Avoid policies that concentrate/focus on upzoning, permit streamlining and other development incentives disproportionately in communities of color and low income communities at risk of or facing gentrification and displacement pressures.
    - Prioritize protections against displacement, 100% affordable, public, and nonprofit housing for development incentives like increased density and accelerated permitting in vulnerable communities.
    - The budget for permanently affordable housing should be as large as possible (maximum instead of “minimum”) in the 10-year Capital Planning.
- Develop and implement community-developed strategies in Cultural Districts to retain and grow culturally associated businesses and services that attract residents back to the area.
  - Comments:
    - This should not just be about attracting residents but about protecting existing residents and existing small businesses
  - Specific Questions:
    - What or who does this keep out? What or who does it keep in?
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
    - Price points that are affordable to local residents and local families
    - People of color businesses that come from within the community

- “Support non-profit developers of new permanently affordable housing developments in Priority Geographies through dedicated funding from GO BONDS or other eligible funding resources to include affordable neighborhood serving uses such as grocery stores, healthcare clinics, or institutional community uses such as child-care facilities, community facilities, job training centers, social services as part of their ground floor use programming.”
  - Comments:
    - Agreed.
  - Specific Questions:
    - Has the community signed off on these priority geographies? What communities and neighborhoods are missing?
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
    - At affordable price points.

- “Support the development of businesses owned by American Indian, Black, and other People of Color in affordable housing buildings.”
  - Comments:
    - All non profit developers approach this work differently. There is a need to uphold a common goal and standard.
  - Specific Questions:
    - What specific policies above and beyond what currently exists will help achieve this goal?
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
    - These people of color-owned businesses should be locally rooted by people who have authentic relationships to their local communities.
    - Support development of worker-owned businesses.
    - Price points that are affordable to local residents and local families
- “Continue and expand efforts to target education and housing readiness counseling programs, including in-language trainings, to support the neighborhood preference program.”
  - **Comments:**
    - These neighborhood preference programs have not lived up to their promise. Too few neighborhood residents are able to benefit from new affordable housing units.
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - What are the metrics that ensure that demographics of residents who move into affordable housing units reflect demographics of surrounding low income communities?
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - Apply and implement metrics to ensure that demographics of residents who move into affordable housing units reflect demographics of surrounding low income neighborhoods.
    - Strong community collaborations and partnerships with community based organizations

- “Explore increasing neighborhood preference allocation for Below Market Rate units in Priority Geographies if possible per the Federal Fair Housing regulations.”
  - **Comments:**
    - These neighborhood preference programs have not lived up to their promise. Too few neighborhood residents are able to benefit from new affordable housing units.
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - What are the metrics that ensure that demographics of residents who move into affordable housing units reflect demographics of surrounding low income communities?
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - Ensure that there is equitable investment and 100% affordable housing development in all districts, so that certain communities are not at a disadvantage because their neighborhoods don’t get a lot of 100% affordable housing built.
    - Apply and implement metrics to ensure that demographics of residents who move into affordable housing units reflect demographics of surrounding low income neighborhoods.
    - Strong community collaborations and partnerships with community based organizations
- “Increase housing affordable to extremely low and very low-income households in Priority Geographies through modifications in inclusionary requirements and prioritizing approval for development projects that serve these income groups.”
  - **Comments:**
    - We don’t agree with relaxing inclusionary requirements or streamlining the approval process for these market rate developments
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - How can we increase affordability and target lower AMI levels in BMR units, while strengthening processes for community input and participation to ensure that all development is responsive to the needs of BIPOC and low income communities?
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - Market rate developers need to provide as many BMR units targeted to as low incomes as possible.
    - For-profit developers must be held accountable by Planning to proactively engage BIPOC and low income communities early on in their development process, and shape their developments to be responsive to the needs of BIPOC and low income communities.

- “Identify and support development of opportunity sites including publicly-owned underutilized sites and large privately-owned sites to respond to both housing needs and community infrastructure especially within Priority Geographies.”
  - **Comments:**
    - Need to do away with top down planning processes at these private and public sites and replace with bottom up processes
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - How can REP and Planning work together to create processes that honor the voices and vision of BIPOC and low income communities to determine how these sites are developed?
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - Publicly owned sites, regardless of location, must be 100% affordable.
    - Area Median Incomes (AMI) in these projects should reflect local neighborhood incomes not regional MOHCD thresholds

- “Continue to support and expedite delivery of the permanently affordable housing projects in Redevelopment Areas led by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII).”
  - **Comments:**
    - None
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - None
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - Ensure strong standards of environmental health and safety
- “Continue to support implementation of HOPE SF projects without displacement of the current residents.”
  - Comments:
    - None
  - Specific Questions:
    - None
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
    - Publicly owned sites, regardless of location, must be 100% affordable.
    - Any increases in density on these publicly owned sites should be 100% affordable

Policy III.2: Expand investments in Priority Geographies to advance equitable access to resources while ensuring community stability.

- “Develop equity metrics and criteria to identify the necessary infrastructure improvements to guide all investment decisions made through a variety of policies and procedures including: Capital Planning, General Plan Elements, Interagency Plan Implementation Committee or Citizen Advisory Council review.”
  - Comments:
    - The Housing Element shouldn’t just say that metrics will be developed but actually spell them out following an authentic community vetting process.
  - Specific Questions:
    - How will Planning work with REP to create this community-led process?
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
    - Equity metrics need to be vetted through authentic community organizations and coalitions

- “Prioritize Priority Geographies in investments to improve transit service, as well as other community infrastructure improvements to parks, streetscape, and neighborhood amenities.”
  - Comments:
    - Improving infrastructure typically leads to increased land and housing speculation, leading to displacement of BIPOC and low income residents.
  - Specific Questions:
    - Has the community signed off on these priority geographies? What communities and neighborhoods are missing?
    - How will we ensure stability and affordability for existing BIPOC and low income residents so they can be the beneficiaries of these community improvements?
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
    - Public investments must be accompanied by strong anti-displacement protections, in order to prevent speculation and gentrification.
“Increase funding for community-based organizations serving American Indian, Black, and other People of Color, and Priority Geographies for anti-displacement services, such as legal services, code enforcement outreach, tenant counseling, mediation, and housing-related financial assistance.”

- **Comments:**
  - We believe a reparations framework is necessary here.
  - This area should also include community development organizations and organizations doing community planning work.
- **Specific Questions:**
  - Where will this funding come from? Will Planning work with REP, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to identify a revenue generating strategy, or a strategy for allocating existing funds for these purposes?
- **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
  - There should be a specific standard for increase in funding, for example, increase funding x10 for these investments

- “Support and expand indigenous community leadership navigation of services and systems to provide tenants’ rights education, similar to the existing Code Enforcement Outreach Program that is offered within the Department of Building Inspection; consider expanding this culturally competent program to other People of Color (American Indian, Black, and other People of Color).”

- **Comments:**
  - This program is already accessible to BIPOC and low income tenants throughout San Francisco, through the network of community based organizations, all of which are in REP.
  - The impediments for holding landlords to standards of habitability are the City’s bureaucratic and legal processes.
- **Specific Questions:**
  - Can Planning work with DBI and other city departments and the Anti-Displacement Coalition and other organizations that participate in CEOP to create greater accountability for landlords?
  - Maybe we can also consider a landlord licensing program as exists in many other cities?
- **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
  - Landlords should be held at least to the California State standards of habitability for all properties they own.

**Policy III.3: Prioritize the City’s acquisition rehabilitation program to serve Priority Geographies and neighborhoods with higher rates of eviction and displacement.**

- Esta lucha es bastante grande
- Que bajos recursos sean verdaderos, la burocracia es cruel y humillante - muchas veces se excluyen la gente que incluyen a las formas/processo de creación
- Muchos requisitos debido a la burocracia
- Also discussed that this can divide communities/orgs given there might be a protagonist
complex of who can purchase/make impact - should be a multi org effort
- Also discussion about who is eligible (people below extremely low, undocumented, wage-earners?)

- “Prioritize purchases for the acquisitions and rehabilitation program that serve extremely low income and unhoused populations.”
  
  **Comments:**
  - The small sites acquisition program is not expansive enough to meet this need.
  - Debe ver algo más claro sobre las organizaciones que pueden comprar edificios - clausuras sobre él % y que requisitos existen para que la gente pueda moverse - no más barreras para tener vivienda
  - We need to be prioritizing land acquisitions as well, to ensure that we have a pipeline of sites ready to be developed for 100% affordable housing.

  **Specific Questions:**
  - How can Planning and REP work together to convene strategic meetings with MOHCD to create an aggressive land banking and small sites acquisition program to meet the city's goals for increasing stability and affordability?
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - Implement a robust land banking program with significant dedicated funding, scaled around a list of priority sites identified by .

- “Increase capacity building investments for non-profits in neighborhoods on the west side of the city with high rates of evictions and displacement.”
  
  **Comments:**
  - These organizations should be supported to build capacity in many areas, including organizing, community planning, community development, tenants rights, eviction defense, etc.
  - Toda las comunidades y organización tiene que estar en la misma página - todas trabajando juntas, no separadas

  **Specific Questions:**
  - What is Planning's role with respect to this capacity building work? For instance, the request from Westside organizations to continue funding for this capacity building work into 2021-22 was not included in the Mayor’s budget.
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - There should be a specific standard for increase in funding, for example, increase funding x10 for these investments

- “Provide incentives for private owners to sell to non-profits affordable housing developers similar to the exemption for the Real Estate Transfer Tax passed in 2020 (Prop I) when selling properties to non-profits.”
  
  **Comments:**
  - Buena idea de apoyar el comprar en la comunidad pero más cambios y cuidado en cómo participar.

  **Specific Questions:**
- How can these programs provide opportunities for tenants to purchase these buildings they reside in?
- **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
  - Enable tenants, not just non profits, to be able to purchase these buildings through a limited equity, nonprofit, cooperative model.

**Policy III.4: Increase homeownership opportunities for American Indian, Black, and other People of Color especially within Priority Geographies to allow for wealth building and reversing historic inequities within these communities.**

- **Target increased investment in the Down Payment Assistance Loan Program to households who live in Priority Geographies.**
  - **Comments:** Ownership is absolutely essential, for short and long term stability. However, the concept of wealth creation through real estate is one of the causes of growing inequality and displacement. Using the DALP and other assistance for BIPOC and low income San Franciscans to be able to purchase homes will lead to greater long term stability, but we should be prioritizing long term affordability as well- not just for the initial purchaser, but for subsequent owners as well. Then, providing services to help these homeowners build their wealth through means other than through their homes will provide a greater long term benefit for both the homeowners and the community at large.

- **Specific Questions:**
  - Has the community signed off on these priority geographies? What communities and neighborhoods are missing?
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - There should be a specific standard for increase in funding, for example, increase funding x10 for these investments

- **Increase targeted outreach and financial readiness education including in-language trainings to American Indian, Black, and People of Color.**
  - **Comments:**
    - None
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - None
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - There should be a specific standard for increase in funding, for example, increase funding x10 for these investments

- **Create new homeownership programs to enable the Black community to grow and thrive by maintaining and expanding their property ownership including mixed-use buildings.**
  - **Comments:**
    - We do not understand this strategy which is focused solely on homeownership for "the Black community" and "mixed-use buildings".
- **Specific Questions:**
  - What is meant by "mixed-use buildings"? and why is this mentioned as a specific strategy only for the Black community?
- **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
  - There should be a specific standard for increase in funding, for example, increase funding x10 for these investments

**Policy III.5: Ensure equitable geographic distribution of new multi-family housing throughout the city to reverse the impacts of exclusionary zoning practices and reduce the burden of concentrating new housing within Priority Geographies.**

- Establish a goal of building 50 percent of the regional housing targets at each income-level, increasing over the long-term, to be built in High Opportunity Neighborhoods within the next two RHNA cycles (by 2038) through zoning changes, streamlining approvals, and encouraging the use of state and local density programs.
- **Comments:**
  - REP rejects both the notion that market rate housing will solve our issues of segregation, un-affordability, gentrification and displacement. Our only experience with market rate housing is that it makes each of these destabilizing factors worse.
  - Streamlining approvals means taking power and agency away from communities, especially BIPOC and low income communities, and therefore, work directly against racial and social equity.
- **Specific Questions:**
  - Has the community signed off on these "High Opportunity Neighborhoods"? What communities and neighborhoods are missing?
- **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
  - Use typology in Urban Displacement Project
    - In geographies susceptible to displacement, at risk of displacement, ongoing displacement, ongoing gentrification
      - Market rate housing works against racial and social equity.
      - 100% affordable with deep affordability should be prioritized
    - In geographies that are characterized as stable moderate/mixed income
      - Market rate housing works against racial and social equity.
      - All AMIs below market rate should be addressed
- **Engage with communities in the new expanded Priority Development Areas in Sunset Corridors, Forest Hill/West Portal, Balboa Park & Southwest Corridors, Richmond Corridors, Lombard Street, 19th Avenue, Central City Neighborhoods to ensure community stability and increased housing choice within these areas.**
  - **Comments:**
- Priority Development Areas and priority geographies are not competent equity mapping.
- Priority Development Areas haven’t been vetted by vulnerable communities
- Priority Development Areas contradict sensitive communities

Specific Questions:
- What does increased housing choice actually mean?
- What strategies do you propose for community stability?

Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
- Focus resources, land use planning, and interdepartmental coordination to identify, purchase and develop sites in all neighborhoods for 100% affordable housing.

- Limit zoning changes within Priority Geographies to the specific needs of American Indian, Black, and other Communities of Color.

Comments:
- It is unclear whether American Indian, Black and other Communities of Color led the process to define and select these "Priority Geographies."
- The process for engaging American Indian, Black and other Communities of Color in defining these zoning changes limitations is crucial. These identified communities need to lead these conversations and be the decision makers.

Specific Questions:
- It’s unclear what zoning changes are being proposed and what limitations are being proposed for these zoning changes.

Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
- Need to incorporate lenses around economic class in addition to race/ethnicity lens so that low income and working class communities are also centered in these planning processes.
- No market rate housing in sensitive communities.
- Truly inclusive, community-led, community based planning processes should determine development priorities.
- Priority Development areas and Priority Geographies are not competent equity mapping.

Policy III.6: Increase housing choice along Rapid bus and rail corridors and near major transit stops in High Opportunity Neighborhoods through zoning changes and streamlining approvals.

- Increase capacity for residential development through changes to height limits, removal of density controls, and other zoning changes to improve feasibility of multi-family buildings especially midrise buildings along SFMTA’s Rapid networks and major nodes such as Geary blvd., Judah Street, 19th Ave, Lombard Street, Ocean Ave, Taraval Street, West Portal Ave, and Van Ness Ave.
- **Comments:**
  - Unlike new, wealthier residents, the existing residents vulnerable to displacement through this gentrification rely on these transit corridors for actual transit -- and they should be prioritized for their use.
  - We are concerned that "increasing housing choice" means that Planning intends to prioritize new market rate housing. Since BIPOC and low income residents rely on these transit corridors and infrastructure, all new housing near this infrastructure needs to be 100% affordable, otherwise BIPOC and low income communities will be forced out and priced out by the new market rate housing and accompanying speculation.

- **Specific Questions:**
  - From the Needs Assessment: the majority of the 85,000 households that came to San Francisco between 1990-2018 are over 200% of AMI. Why are we prioritizing market-rate housing for these wealthier newcomers who will not be taking many of these Rapid Network routes such as the 14R bus.
  - What is the equity lens that will prevent these wealthy new residents from gentrifying and displacing low-income BIPOC residents who live along many of these routes?

- **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
  - "High Opportunity" is not a competent measure of safety - “Highest Resource” coupled with exempting current UC Berkeley Urban Displacement Project “Sensitive Communities” is an at least improved level of safety to build MR housing.

- **Identify community benefits that would allow streamlined approval of midrise multi-family buildings within High Opportunity Areas, such as units serving middle-income households, inclusionary requirements, land dedication for permanently affordable housing, or ground floor space for neighborhood serving community facilities or businesses.**

- **Comments:**
  - No streamlined approval of new market rate housing. No pre-identification of "community benefits". These should be part and parcel of a project- and not a condition leading to streamlined approval.

- **Specific Questions:**
  - Has the community signed off on these high opportunity geographies? What communities and neighborhoods are missing?

- **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
  - Streamlining project approvals does not advance racial or social equity.
- Explore the possibility of high-rise towers at major transit nodes along Rapid bus and rail corridors within High Opportunity Neighborhood parallel with needed infrastructure improvements.

  - **Comments:**
    - Unlike new, wealthier residents, the existing residents vulnerable to displacement through this gentrification rely on these transit corridors for actual transit -- and they should be prioritized for their use.
    - We are concerned that Planning intends for these high-rise towers to be market rate housing. Since BIPOC and low income residents rely on these transit corridors and infrastructure, all new housing near this infrastructure needs to be 100% affordable, otherwise BIPOC and low income communities will be forced out and priced out by the new market rate housing and accompanying speculation.

  - **Specific Questions:**
    - From the Needs Assessment: the majority of the 85,000 households that came to San Francisco between 1990-2018 are over 200% of AMI. Why are we prioritizing market-rate housing for these wealthier newcomers who will not be taking many of these Rapid Network routes such as the 14R bus.
    - What is the equity lens that will prevent these wealthy new residents from gentrifying and displacing low-income BIPOC residents who live along many of these routes?
    - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
      - “High Opportunity” is not a competent measure of safety - “Highest Resource” coupled with exempting current UC Berkeley Urban Displacement Project “Sensitive Communities” is an at least improved level of safety to build MR housing.

**Policy III.7: Increase housing choice by allowing and facilitating small multi-family buildings in low-density areas within High Opportunity Neighborhoods.**

- Transition to using building form and scale (e.g. Height and bulk requirements) and unit minimums to regulate development instead of lot-based unit maximums in low-density zoned residential districts in High Opportunity Neighborhoods.

  - **Comments:**
    - This entire section seeks to find incentives for market rate development which will never solve the affordable housing problems that communities across San Francisco face. For-profit developers will always seek to maximize profits - they will never have equity or affordability as their goals or as features of their business plans.

  - **Specific Questions:**
    - How would this change impact the incentives to build family-sized units?
- **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
  - “High Opportunity” is not a competent equity measure - “Highest Resource” coupled with exempting current UC Berkeley Urban Displacement Project “Sensitive Communities” is an at least improved level of safety to build MR housing.

- **Identify community benefits that would allow streamlined approval of small multi-family buildings in High Opportunity Areas such as units serving middle-income households, affordable housing fees, or ground floor space for neighborhood serving community facilities or businesses.**

  - **Comments:**
    - No streamlined approval of new market rate housing. Community benefits should be part and parcel of a project- and not a pre-identified list that allows for streamlined approvals.
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - Has the community signed off on these high opportunity geographies? What communities and neighborhoods are missing?
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - “High Opportunity” is not a competent equity measure - “Highest Resource” coupled with exempting current UC Berkeley Urban Displacement Project “Sensitive Communities” is an at least improved level of safety to build market rate housing.
    - Streamlining project approvals do not advance racial equity.

- **Improve financial feasibility of small multi-family buildings by promoting appropriate construction types, financing, or incentives to small-scale developers**

  - **Comments:**
    - It's unclear why Planning feels that the role of our Planning department should be to help for-profit developers with implementing their market rate housing developments. These developments only increase housing priced, speculation, displacement and gentrification. We need to focus our city resources on solving the challenge of increasing housing that is affordable for BIPOC and low income people.
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - How do you define small multi-family buildings?
    - What kinds of incentives do you mean?
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - We need to focus our city resources on creating opportunities for affordable housing, and providing resources to stabilize and develop affordable housing at all scales.
Policy III.8: Enable low and moderate-income households particularly American Indian, Black, and other People of Color to live and prosper in High Opportunity Neighborhoods through increasing units that are permanently affordable.

- Increase housing affordable to extremely and very low-income households in High Opportunity Areas through City funded permanently affordable housing projects.

  - **Comments:**
    - Affordable housing should be increased in all neighborhoods.
  
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - Why is affordable housing only focused on “High Opportunity Neighborhoods”? Were these neighborhoods defined by American Indian, Black and other People of Color?
  
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - Prioritize 100% affordable housing throughout San Francisco to achieve desegregation, affordability and stability.

- Create a funded land banking program to purchase sites that could accommodate at least 50 units on each site in High Opportunity neighborhoods, such as church sites and partnership with interfaith council.

  - **Comments:**
    - This strategy will need to be coordinated with MOHCD as they have fought against land banking efforts for many years.
  
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - Why is this strategy only confined to “High Opportunity Neighborhoods”? and why is this strategy only targeted at sites that can accommodate 50+ units?
  
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - Publicly owned sites, or sites acquired with public monies, regardless of location, must be 100% affordable.

- Expand ministerial review to smaller sized residentially zoned parcels to improve feasibility of developing permanently affordable housing on these sites.

  - **Comments:**
    - Ministerial review should only be available for 100% affordable housing.
  
  - **Specific Questions:**
    - What is the definition of “affordable housing” as proposed in this section?
  
  - **Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:**
    - Community process to decide how to prioritize affordable housing investments in local communities
- Pursue public private partnerships on public sites to deliver a maximum number of permanently affordable units on those sites by leveraging private investments in market-rate units with public funding permanently affordable.
  - Comments:
    - Public sites must be developed as 100% affordable housing.
  - Specific Questions:
    - How is the city defining “public private partnerships”? How will these partnerships ensure that we develop public sites with 100% affordable housing?
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
    - Publicly owned sites, regardless of location, must be 100% affordable.
    - No sell-off of public land

- Establish a goal of dedicating 50 percent of the City's permanently affordable housing budget within 10-year capital planning cycles for High Opportunity Neighborhoods while dedicating a minimum budget to support funding for planned affordable housing in Priority Geographies.
  - Comments:
    - See standard below
  - Specific Questions:
    - Has the community signed off on these priority geographies? What communities and neighborhoods are missing? Why is eliminating displacement limited to priority geographies? Example: Half of the Latino Cultural District is not even covered. Chinatown? Westside?
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
    - “High Opportunity” is not a competent measure.
    - 100% affordable with deep affordability should be prioritized

- Create and expand funding for programs that offer case management, financial literacy education, and housing readiness to low-income American Indian, Black and other People of Color households who seek housing choices in High Opportunity Areas, along with providing incentives and counseling to landlords to offer their unit.
  - Comments:
    - These programs should be directed by these vulnerable communities.
  - Specific Questions:
    - What will the process be for creating and expanding this funding - and for selecting the programs that will be supported?
  - Specific standards that we believe will enable the city to achieve racial and social equity:
4. **POLICY #4: Increase housing production to improve affordability for the city’s current and future residents**
   - **Issue #1:** The assumption that increasing housing production increases affordability. There is no evidence that this strategy has ever worked.
   - **Issue #2:** This current policy is not designed to support the city’s current population. Rather, it intends to replace current residents with those who are increasingly affluent.
   - **Issue #3:** There is no clear definition of “affordable housing” so the concern is that affordable housing will become out of reach for those who need it most.
   - **Issue #4:** No strategy identified for increasing local sources of funding for housing that’s affordable for extremely low income households.

**IV.1 Create a dedicated and consistent local funding stream and advocate for State and Federal funding to support building permanently affordable housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households that meets the Regional Housing Needs Allocation targets.**

- **Identify local bonds and consistent sources of funding for permanently affordable housing in the City’s Capital Planning process.**
  Comment: Bonds require ⅔ vote to pass as do other dedicated sources of new revenue. They are worthwhile pursuing, but can be challenging to pass. Designing these revenue measures and prioritizing their uses need to be led by BIPOC and low income communities.

- **Develop and deploy public financing tools to leverage the City’s co-investments such as an Infrastructure Finance District or expanded tax programs for affordable homeownership and workforce housing (e.g., financing products that lower direct City subsidy for affordable housing).**
  Comment: Sources of revenue for affordable housing should not be dependent on increasing property values or other speculative schemes. Funding affordable housing through land speculation will perpetuate the problems that have already been created.

- **Create an implementation plan for the annual funding through the new gross receipt tax to increase supportive housing and take advantage of the State-wide streamlining opportunities for this type of housing.**
  Comment: Communities are not in favor of removing community engagement through state pre-emption.

- **Develop and support alternative and philanthropic funding sources to deliver permanently affordable housing faster and at a cheaper per unit cost through tools such as the Housing Accelerator Fund or creating a Land Equity Fund.**
  Comment: Support the Bay Area Housing Financing Authority to propose a regional progressive tax as a permanently affordable housing funding source.

- **Advocate for federal legislation to increase Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and Private Activity Bonds, or advocate for voter approvals to reduce the minimum thresholds for tax exempt bond financing (currently at 50 percent) and to help unlock more Low-Income Housing Tax Credits.**
Comment: The Low Income Housing Tax Credit program has been devastating for tenants, and has extraordinarily high fixed costs leading to developments needing to be at least 75 units in size before they are financially feasible. This excludes most sites in the city from affordable housing development. In order to expand the possibilities for developing new affordable housing in every neighborhood, we need to generate significant sources of local revenue, and use the LIHTC only on larger sites that yield sufficient units.

- **Advocate for State legislation to change the voter approval threshold for General Obligation Bonds from two-thirds to 55 percent.**
  
  Comment: None

- **Advocate for State legislation to expand non-competitive permanently affordable housing funding sources.**
  
  Comment: None

- **Advocate for voter approval paths to create new sources of funding such as Proposition 13 reform for commercial property tax, to support local jurisdictions in delivering their permanently affordable housing targets.**
  
  Comment: None

IV.2 Maintain sufficient development capacity to respond to the increasing housing need and the scarcity of housing supply within San Francisco and the region.

Continue to maintain sufficient development capacity that accommodates the San Francisco’s Regional Housing Needs Allocations determined by the State and regional agencies as well as long term housing need projections.

Comment: We need to define "sufficient" and "development capacity". For instance, does this refer to zoning capacity? Or does it refer to our nonprofit affordable housing developer network? Another concern is that we don't know what affordable housing development capacity we need, because this city has never been able to keep up with its RHNA goals for affordable housing. We, however, have far too much capacity constantly over-producing market rate housing.

Pursue zoning changes to increase development capacity that accommodates equitable distribution of growth throughout the city particularly in High Opportunity Neighborhoods and new Priority Development Areas

Comment: Since SF has over-produced market rate housing through the prior RHNA period, the only equity approach would be to focus housing production on 100% affordable strategies. Market rate housing increases housing and land speculation and yields only upward pressure on housing prices.
Collaborate with regional agencies and other jurisdictions within the region to coordinate on strategic policies that respond to the relationship between commute patterns and types of housing needed.

Comment: Yes, but we should be clear that our Bay Area neighbors need to pull their weight in producing and maintaining affordable housing.

IV.3 Reduce development constraints such as high construction cost and lengthy City-permitting timeline to increase housing choices and improve affordability.

Comment: These are extremely vaguely phrased. What are "development constraints" and how will they be "reduced"? How is the city going to reduce construction costs? Require that construction workers be paid less? Somehow reduce the price of lumber? What housing choices do not exist that the city feels it needs to create? How will any of these ill-defined strategies lead to improved affordability?

Expand the use of cost-efficient construction types such as modular and materials such as cross laminated timber.

Comment: Typically, if developers cut their development costs, they don't pass those savings on in the form of reduced rents or sales prices. Rather, they pocket the difference as profit. If Planning is going to expend city resources to enable cost efficiencies in the development industry, it must demand long term price concessions in return.

Support a more efficient construction process by increasing flexibility of lot size limits for allowing lot consolidation.

Comment: Questionable policy. We need to abandon the notion that creating an oversupply of market rate housing units will generate sufficient housing to address the long term housing needs of vulnerable communities and communities of color.

Expand Impact Fee exemption to a broader range of permanently affordable housing projects including those with units affordable up to 120% of AMI on projects that rely on philanthropic subsidies.

Comment: it's unclear what "permanently affordable housing projects" are charged impact fees. Where does this apply? And what affordable housing projects target up to 120% of AMI? It's unclear what problem this strategy is trying to solve.

Reduce the per unit cost of publicly funded permanently affordable housing through streamlining the implementation of associated development approvals such as the PG&E requirements in accommodating Public Utilities Commission (PUC) provided low-cost electric service, or the multi-agency review of disability access.

Comment: This seems very specific and technical, and therefore, needs further explanation so people can understand what the problem is and how this proposed solution addresses that problem.
Expand the construction workforce through training programs in partnership with non-City apprenticeship programs and expand the Local Hire program to allow more projects to participate.
Comment: None

Reduce approval time and process by eliminating Planning Commission hearings for State Density Bonus project applications that do not otherwise require them.
Comment: Absolutely do not eliminate Planning commission hearings for State Density Bonus project applications. This is a developer giveaway. The public has to have the opportunity to weigh in on projects that potentially impact them and affect their communities. The fact that these projects inflict even greater physical and economic impacts on communities than non-density bonus projects means that there should be increased public participation and input rather than less.

Streamline permitting review and approval process for large master planned projects to accelerate construction timelines of infrastructure improvements.
Comment: Given the fact that there are tens of thousands of units that Planning has already approved that have not started their building permit process, it is unclear what problem this is trying to solve. Planning has already been incredibly efficient with reviewing and approving new development projects, including large master planned projects like Parkmerced and Balboa Reservoir. The impacts of these large master planned developments are so large that public input and participation are vitally necessary especially in order to have any hope of equitable outcomes.

Expand projects types that are eligible for streamlined or ministerial review (relying on Prop E models or SB35) beyond projects with 50-100 percent permanently affordable housing.
Comment: As stated above, there should be no "streamlined" approval for market rate housing. This strategy works against equity goals and outcomes.

Continue to implement the Mayoral Executive Directives to accelerate creating new housing (Mayor Breed’s Executive Directive 18-01 and Mayor Lee’s Executive Directive 17-02).
Comment: As stated above, there should be no "streamlined" approval for market rate housing. This strategy works against equity goals and outcomes.

Develop Objective Design Standards that reduce subjective design review of housing projects while ensuring that new development in existing neighborhoods adheres to key urban design principles.
Comment: All neighborhoods must benefit from high quality design. As stated above, however, there should be no "streamlined" approval for market rate housing. This strategy works against equity goals and outcomes.
Pursue California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Streamlining for projects through Community Plan Exemptions or by adopting Housing Sustainability Districts where possible.
Comment: As stated above, there should be no "streamlined" approval for market rate housing. This strategy works against equity goals and outcomes.

Prioritize Planning Department staff resources on review of Discretionary Review applications that contain tenant protection issues and those within Priority Geographies over applications in High Opportunity Neighborhoods that do not involve tenant considerations.
Comment: As stated above, the REP Coalition does not understand these references to Priority Geographies and High Opportunity Neighborhoods- why should tenant protections only be focused on these areas?

IV.4 Maximize the number of permanently affordable housing units constructed through private development without public subsidy.
Comment: The REP Coalition does not understand this strategy. Market rate developers have demonstrated that they want to provide the minimum number of BMR units and at as high AMI levels as they are able.

Through the Inclusionary Technical Analysis Committee, review the inclusionary rates on a regular basis to ensure development projects maintain financial feasibility in all neighborhoods in order to maximize total number of below-market rate units delivered without public subsidy.
Comment: Whenever politicians re-open the discussion of feasibility of inclusionary units, developers cry poor, and we end up with a reduction of the number of units required and an increase in the AMI targeting. Therefore, it seems like this strategy will only increase market rate housing and decrease the number of affordable units, and make the BMR units less affordable.

Prioritize maximum permanently affordable housing as a major benefit of new development agreements alongside other benefits such as community facilities or transit investments.
Comment: Other strategies advocate for reduction in community benefits and “streamlining” which reduce leverage for increasing community benefits and affordable housing. Rather than requiring development agreements, Planning should put BIPOC and low income communities in leadership roles for determining how their communities should develop, requiring public facilities and transit investments which would then be explicitly required of developers rather than being negotiated without the community having any leverage.
Support and streamline the approval process for development projects that maximize the total number of below-market rate units via State Density Bonus or other density bonus programs, or other Code complying regulatory paths.
Comment: As stated above, there should be no "streamlined" approval for market rate housing. This strategy works against equity goals and outcomes.

Expand density bonus programs to allow additional below market rate unit in exchange for Planning Code modifications or exemptions.
Comment: As stated above, there should be no "streamlined" approval for market rate housing. This strategy works against equity goals and outcomes. Density bonus projects only serve to accelerate displacement, speculation and gentrification.

IV.5 Maximize the use of publicly-owned sites for permanently affordable housing in balance with community infrastructure and facilities needed that can be accommodated on those sites.

Support maximum number of permanently affordable housing units as well as improved transit facilities on SFMTA owned sites slated for development such as the Presidio Bus Yard, and the Potrero Bus Yard, through leveraging private investment in market-rate units with public funding.
Comment: All publicly owned sites must be developed as 100% affordable housing. For every public site we sell to a for profit developer for market rate housing, we will need to purchase new sites at market rate for affordable housing. This is an incredibly inefficient use of public resources. If the concern is not having enough money to develop all those affordable housing units, then consider those developments on large public sites as being phased developments.

Identify City-owned surplus sites and other underutilized publicly-owned sites and prioritize city resources to plan for and develop housing on those sites.
Comment: All publicly owned sites must be developed as 100% affordable housing.

IV.6 Require new commercial developments and large employers, hospitals, and educational institutions to help meet housing demand generated by job growth.

Evaluate feasibility of utilizing a portion of existing or future growth in fees and taxes generated by large employers to fund affordable housing on an ongoing basis, in order to complement the one-time jobs housing linkage fees assessed on developers of commercial space.
Comment: None
Encourage and provide opportunities for large commercial developments to build housing or dedicate land in lieu of their jobs housing linkage fee.
Comment: Tying an affordable housing requirement to commercial developments is encouraged. REP has not determined whether it is acceptable to allow a land dedication in lieu of paying a jobs housing linkage fee.

Provide paths for large employers to contribute funding in partnership with non-profit developers to provide homeownership opportunities.
Comment: REP does NOT support this proposal which then creates a quid pro quo for nonprofit developers to support these employers’ expansions and development ambitions. Employers should pay fees to the city, and nonprofit developers should then apply for those funds.

Maintain the jobs housing linkage program and adjust the fee levels based on an updated nexus study on a regular basis.
Comment: This seems like a good idea, as long as the updates happen on a regular basis, and the process is transparent and not influenced by lobbying by the businesses that pay, or might have to pay the fee.

Explore expanding jobs housing linkage fees to large employer institutional developments (medical and educational) who are currently not subject to jobs housing linkage fees.
Comment. Yes. And expand the jobs housing linkage fees to large employers that might have multiple locations - each of which has just a few employees, but in the aggregate have hundreds or thousands of employees in San Francisco such as certain formula beverage and food service and retail businesses.

Pursue partnerships such as institutional master plans where large employer institutions that are not subject to job housing linkage fees (hospitals and educational institutions) to plan for the housing demand of their employees (such as the 2021 Memorandum of Understanding with the University of California, San Francisco).
Comment: We do not understand the rationale for excluding large employer institutions from jobs housing linkage fees. Why have an MOU with these institutions? Why not require them to pay a jobs housing linkage fee?

IV.7 Address the impediments to constructing approved housing that is already approved, especially large master plans and development agreements such as Treasure Island, Candlestick Park, Hunters Point Shipyard, Parkmerced, HOPE SF projects, Schlage Lock.
Comment: It is not up to the Planning Department to facilitate construction of market rate housing. Equitable outcomes necessitate the government doing
everything it can, mobilizing all resources, to facilitate construction of 100% affordable housing. If developers have received entitlements, and are not able to move those projects forward into construction, the city should have a program for purchasing those sites so they can be developed as 100% affordable housing.

**Explore public-private partnership solutions for front-ending the necessary funding for infrastructure investments, such as direct City investment in infrastructure, allocation of public financing for infrastructure improvements, or issuance of other public debt to fund infrastructure improvements.**

Comment: Public private partnerships always favor the private, for-profit entity. These lead to outcomes that work directly against equity. The infrastructure is required to add value to private, for-profit enterprise rather than providing equitable outcomes where people with low incomes benefit from the new infrastructure investment. No private (for-profit) entity is interested in equitable outcomes- they will only pursue a public-private partnership where they stand to profit from the actions of government.

**Advocate for regional and State funds through the existing infrastructure bank or other paths to help finance the infrastructure needs of large urban infill and redevelopment projects.**

Comment: We do not understand this strategy. What is an "existing infrastructure bank"? What "other paths to help finance..." are there? Please clarify so we can evaluate what this strategy is proposing.

### IV.8 Maximize the use of existing housing stock for residential use by discouraging vacancy, short-term use, and speculative resale.

**Explore legislating a vacancy tax for residential units that stay empty for long periods of a year or used as secondary or vacation homes.**

Comment: A tax requires a ballot measure while a fee can be implemented legislatively. It would be best to explore both possible strategies.

**Explore regulatory paths, including a tax or other regulatory structures, for speculative resale of residential units, particularly those which seek to extract value out of evicting tenants, or rapid reselling to more lucrative markets.**

Comment: This proposal is confusing. A tax is not a "regulatory path"- so it does not make sense to "explore regulatory paths, including a path or other regulatory structures". It would be better to have a taxation strategy, and another strategy that looks at regulatory paths and structures- and to be clear about what those regulatory paths and strategies might be so we can evaluate their equity impacts. On a conceptual level, however, diminishing or disincentivizing speculative, extractive activities seems to makes sense.
Continue to improve compliance, enforcement, and restrictions on short-term rentals
Comment: This makes sense, but Planning still has not implemented the Intermediate Length Occupancy program. ILOs are causing a larger impact on gentrification, speculation and displacement than STRs at this point because there is no enforcement of the caps and restrictions.

IV.9 Preserve the affordability of unauthorized dwelling units while improving safety and habitability.

Provide more paths for legalizations through financial support such as low-interest or forgivable loans for property owners.
Comment: Yes. And include outreach to homeowners so they are aware of the program.

Update the Conditional Use findings requirements for removal of unauthorized dwelling units to account for tenancy, and to identify alternative findings to the current financial hardship analysis to measure the cost burden of legalization.
Comment: None

Provide more paths for legalization by removing requirements that are not critical for health or safety (such as minimum ceiling heights) and would help reduce the costs of legalization.
Comment: No. Minimum ceiling heights should remain required.

IV.10 Encourage provision of the maximum number of units when existing housing stock is proposed for major expansions or demolition. NO

Continue to apply the requirements of State Law to replace any affordable or rent-controlled units demolished with permanently affordable units at equivalent affordability rates of the unit prior to demolition (SB330).
Comment: We do not support codifying SB 330 into the Housing Element 2022. SB 330 expires in 2025. This would be terrible for tenants who will be displaced without adequate protections, or provisions including relocation compensation, or somewhere to move to. Equivalent affordability rates does not mean at the same affordable (rent controlled rent).

Pursue code and policy changes to encourage new housing projects and major expansion projects build to maximum allowable unit density and discourage major expansions of existing single-family homes where additional units are otherwise permitted.
Comment: This is the antithesis of good planning- and also works against equity goals. Pursuing the proliferation of market rate units and tenant displacement works directly against equity. Increasing market rate housing production only does one
thing- it increases the stock of unaffordable housing. It does nothing to improve affordability or equity.

RETURN TO THE TOP

5. POLICY #5: Increase housing choices for the city's diverse cultures, lifestyles, abilities, family structures, and income levels.

V.1: Promote and facilitate aging in place for seniors and multi-generational living.
   - Create or support financing programs that help low and moderate income homeowners upgrade their homes for age-related disability issues or build ADUs to age in the same building.
     Comment: None
   - Increase permanently affordable senior housing along transit corridors to improve mobility of aging adults and seniors.
     Comment: None
   - Identify and address the challenges faced by residential care facilities to prevent their loss, such as increasing flexibility in how the use is defined under the Planning Code.
     Comment: None
   - Support and explore expanding the Home Match Program to match seniors with people looking for housing that can provide in-home care support in exchange for affordable rent.
     Comment: This program needs to be carefully managed in order to safeguard seniors against elder abuse-financial and/or physical.

V.2: Prevent the outmigration of families with children and support the needs of families to grow.
   - Encourage provision of child-friendly amenities within new buildings through tools such as a design review checklist.
     Comment: Development of any design review checklist(s) must be led by BIPOC and low-income residents.
   - Allow flexibility in the development of ground floor rooms in Single Family Homes to accommodate changing family needs such as additional bedrooms, full bathroom, or laundry.
     Comment: None
   - Continue the multi-bedroom unit mix requirements
     Comment: It’s unclear what these requirements are since there is no reference. Therefore, we are unable to evaluate this strategy.
   - Support and incentivize housing, especially permanently affordable housing with multiple bedrooms for families, near existing high-rated public schools.
Comment: There should be no incentivizing of market rate housing. The market can take care of itself. Permanently affordable family housing near public schools is critical, but we shouldn't be prioritizing "high-rated" schools. We should encourage equitable investment in all our schools, and support our families' children attending them and succeeding.

- **Collaborate with the SFUSD to identify priority in the school assignment process for low-income families and those living in permanently affordable housing.**
  Comment: These decisions should be led by BIPOC and low income residents.

### V.3: Retain and increase the moderate and middle-income households through building permanently affordable workforce housing.

- **Continue to support educator housing programs and seek to expand its application to other public-sector essential workers such as transit operators and hospital workers.**
  Comment: We should prioritize permanently affordable housing accessible to a range of incomes rather than creating enclaves by employment sectors. The market will not provide affordable housing. We need a land use plan that recognizes this and plans strategically for affordable housing - price restricted housing.

- **Pursue new partnership models to allow non-City financing of moderate and middle income homeownership through parallel development of smaller sized lots that are scattered (such as Habitat for Humanity models).**
  Comment: It's unclear what a "new partnership" model is that's being referenced. The Habitat model is clear- that's for homeowners who both are physically able to provide much of their own construction labor, and are also able to pay the mortgage for their new home. But we cannot comment on this strategy because the partnership concept is not clear.

- **Pursue partnership models to purchase privately-owned entitled sites where construction may be stalling.**
  Comment: Same as the prior strategy- it is not clear what a "partnership model" is and how that addresses feasibility issues for projects that have stalled.

- **Continue funding to the First Responders Down Payment Assistance Loan Program and the SFUSD Educators Down Payment Assistance Loan Program.**
  Comment: None

### V.4: Facilitate small multi-family buildings as a prominent housing type that private development can deliver to serve middle income households.

- **Identify and promote construction types, financing and design that would make small multi-family buildings feasible.**
  Comment: Why would Planning expend resources to help developers build more market rate housing? If our housing policies and strategies are truly centering equity, all resources would be focused on developing strategies for producing affordable housing.
- Identify and adopt incentives that could make small multi-family buildings possible, such as exemptions from some fees, modified inclusionary requirement, streamlined approval and demolition review.
  Comment: Why would Planning expend resources to help developers build more market rate housing? If our housing policies and strategies are truly centering equity, all resources would be focused on developing strategies for producing affordable housing. As noted above, streamlining and fee exemptions are disempowering to communities and lead to perpetuation of inequitable outcomes.
- Transition to using building form and scale (e.g., Height and bulk requirements) and unit minimums to regulate development instead of lot-based unit maximums in the low-density zoned residential districts in High Opportunity Neighborhoods.
  Comment: We are not understanding how “unit minimums” would be applied. Is this a strategy to make sure that developers don’t develop 9 units to avoid inclusionary requirements? We are also not clear which parts of the city are targeted by the language “low-density zoned residential districts in High Opportunity Neighborhoods”, so it is impossible for us to evaluate this strategy.
- Identify certain community benefits that would allow streamlined approval of small multi-family buildings in High Opportunity Areas such as units serving middle-income households, affordable housing fees, or ground floor space for neighborhood serving community facilities or businesses.
  Comment: Market rate housing will never be affordable, or at least not permanently affordable. Market rate, for-profit developers operating without any price restrictions will always charge as much as they can. There should be no streamlining or relaxation of fees or BMR obligations. This strategy shifts even more power away from BIPOC and low-income San Franciscans and gives more power and profit to for-profit developers which is unacceptable.

V.5: Promote group housing as an entry-level housing option for moderate income households, particularly single-person households.

- Allow conversion of existing single-family homes to group housing units.
  Comment: The REP Coalition rejects strategies that encourage new group housing or conversions to group housing until there is an inclusive, BIPOC and low-income community led conversation about what group housing actually is, and its impacts on our communities.
- Set minimum quality of life standards for group housing such as access to common open space.
  Comment: The REP Coalition rejects strategies that encourage new group housing or conversions to group housing until there is an inclusive, BIPOC and low-income community led conversation about what group housing actually is, and its impacts on our communities.
- Allow group housing as a principally permitted use where residential use is allowed.
  Comment: The REP Coalition rejects strategies that encourage new group housing or conversions to group housing until there is an inclusive, BIPOC and low-income
community led conversation about what group housing actually is, and its impacts on our communities.

V.6: Continue to support and expand the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) program.

- Continue to streamline the permit process through interagency coordination (e.g., Roundtable Review) implement an integrated online permitting system to support permit streamlining and government transparency.
  
  Comment: It is not clear what a "roundtable review" is, who it involves, who it empowers, but streamlined permitting seems to cancel the voices of BIPOC and low income communities and works against equity and transparency.

- Provide advanced notice to existing tenants when adding an ADU in a building, minimize the conversion of existing shared spaces and amenities such as in-building laundry, and ensure the Rent Ordinance provides protections if such removals take place.
  
  Comment: It's unclear whether this strategy is recommending changes to the Rent Ordinance or if it is just asking that the Rent Board process reduction in services or unlawful eviction complaints (which they already do). This strategy is confusing and unclear, but it seems to want to protect tenants from having their parking or storage or other common area uses taken away?

- Create an affordable ADU program to serve low-income households.
  
  Comment: As long as these ADUs are permanently affordable, price restricted, this seems like a great strategy.

- Encourage Junior ADUs as an effective and low-cost way of adding habitable space within existing single-family homes...
  
  Comment: It's unclear how small JADUs are. These units should meet habitability standards. They should also be restricted as permanently affordable, price restricted units, otherwise, over time, landlords will increase the prices of these units to the point where they are no longer "affordable" for low income households.

- Advocate for State legislation to provide more flexibility for detached ADUs in denser cities with smaller lots.
  
  Comment: What is a "denser city"? Isn't this the plan for San Francisco? Or are other cities incorporated into this strategy? And what's a "smaller lot"? Smaller than what? Please clarify this strategy so we can understand it and comment on it.

- Continue to expand public outreach for the ADU program including virtually accessible information and in-language materials.
  
  Comment: None

V.7: Strengthen homeownership programs to allow upward mobility for families

- Evaluate opportunities for greater wealth building within the City's existing homeownership programs.
  
  Comment: Wealth building through property is one of the reasons we've gotten to this point of BIPOC and low income communities being displaced by for-profit development and speculation. We need to start looking at homes as providing stability and anchoring communities. Wealth creation then happens through being
paid a decent wage, and not having that wage siphoned off by extraordinary housing costs.

- **Advocate for State Legislation that would allow for scaled Homeowners Association fees for BMR homeowners in mixed income buildings in order to ensure equal access to shared building services and amenities at equitable prices.**
  
  Comment: This is an extremely important strategy, to advocate for State legislation that allows for scaled HOA fees for BMR homeowners. But, to be clear, the reason this is important is not so low income homeowners can go to the gym. The reason this is important is that the HOA fees make the monthly payments so high that low income purchasers of BMR units cannot afford BMR ownership units. BMR ownership units are typically a farce, because the sales prices are set to comply with the BMR program, but the HOA fees are so high that qualifying households are still unable to purchase the units. It's not about being able to go to the gym for a lower monthly fee; it's about being able to have an affordable home.

- **Include scaled fees for any building services or amenities in rental or homeownership projects with Below Market Rate households.**
  
  Comment: None

- **Continue to provide legal representation and other support services that are culturally competent for BMR unit owners and residents to avoid foreclosures and/or address discrimination.**
  
  Comment: None

- **Create an exception to the requirement for first-time homebuyers of BMR units allow households to purchase another BMR unit and sell their current unit in cases where household size changes or another reasonable accommodation is required, in order to respond to changing housing needs.**
  
  Comment: None

### General Comments to this Policy:

- **Upzoning and removing density controls do not provide more “housing choices.”**

- **These tactics create more unaffordable luxury market-rate housing that does not meet the needs of current residents, especially the needs of BIPOC and low income communities. The network of cultural districts should also be empowered to lead on these decisions.**

### 6. POLICY #6: Promote neighborhoods that are well connected, healthy and rich with community culture.

**Policy VI.1: Facilitate neighborhoods where proximity to daily needs promote social connections, support the City’s sustainability goals, and advance a healthy environment.**

- "Incentivize and support new housing developments that include affordable and essential neighborhood serving uses such as grocery stores, childcare centers, healthcare clinics on the ground floor through programs such as streamlined approval for community benefits, or rental subsidies."

  Comment: We cannot rely on private development to provide the necessary components of complete and healthy neighborhoods. Private development at a minimum should already be required to provide community serving uses, there should be no additional incentives or streamlining for community benefits or rental subsidies. And "community benefits" should not be predetermined, but should be
responsive to the needs of BIPOC and low income communities. The network of cultural districts should also be empowered to lead on these decisions.

- **Support mixed-use buildings during regulatory review process and encourage commercial space or other compatible uses on the ground floor.**  
  Comment: BIPOC and low income communities, and especially the network of cultural districts should be empowered to establish what ground floor uses should be encouraged and should lead the "regulatory review process".

- **Incentivize new permanently affordable housing developments to include below market rate commercial leases for community-based organizations serving the neighborhood community.**  
  Comment: BIPOC and low income communities, and especially the network of cultural districts should be empowered to establish prioritization of commercial and services uses.

- **Plan for and dedicate funding for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and safety improvements to encourage walking and biking when accessing to daily needs.**  
  Comment: None

- **Create and fund an interagency working group to plan and design for walkable neighborhoods and proximity to daily needs.**  
  Comment: This must also be led by advocates for seniors, people with disabilities, youth and families.

- **Expand and allow neighborhood serving uses, such as retail, restaurants, and hair salons within areas that are primarily residential especially on corner parcels.**  
  Comment: BIPOC and low income communities, and especially the network of cultural districts should be empowered to establish prioritization of commercial and services uses. As we have seen very clearly during the pandemic, we need to encourage public health clinics that are physically and culturally/linguistically accessible especially in BIPOC and low income areas across the city.

- **“Improve flexibility on allowing home-based businesses and activities and work from home.”**  
  Comment: This should be more thoroughly discussed - what does this look like in the context of planning, development, and approvals? How will this be sensitive to and inclusive of non traditional, culturally distinct, or informal work and the associated permission required to conduct business at home?

**Policy VI.2: Ensure transportation investments and new housing are planned in parallel to advance well-connected neighborhoods and equitable access to transit.**

General Comments to this Policy:

- a. Upzoning and removing density controls do not provide more “housing choices.” These tactics create more unaffordable luxury market-rate housing that does not meet the needs of current residents, especially the needs of BIPOC and low income residents.
b. With the increase in ride-sharing, especially during COVID when there has been a significant dip in transit ridership, the city must study the transit patterns of wealthy residents. Are occupants of new market-rate housing going to be waiting for a crowded bus, or use ride-sharing services? 100% affordable housing near transit infrastructure must be prioritized.

c. There is no current transit infrastructure that can support the type of “transit oriented development” that is being proposed. There is not even a plan in place to increase transit capacity to meet even current levels of demand. Increasing the burden on transit and other city infrastructure without the capacity to meet it is bad city planning.

- **Increase housing choice through changes to height limits, removal of density controls and other zoning changes to improve feasibility of multi-family buildings along SFMTA Rapid Lines.**
  Comment: Removing density controls works against the goal of increased family housing along transit lines as stated elsewhere. We are already seeing how removing density controls leads to proliferation of micro-units and group housing which are tiny, unaffordable units that are not family friendly. It is confusing that this strategy refers both to removing density controls and “multi-family” buildings. These are two entirely different typologies.

- **Establish a goal of building 50% of the regional housing targets at each income level to be built in High Opportunity Neighborhoods within the next two RHNA cycles (by 2038) through zoning changes, streamlining approvals and encouraging use of state and local density programs.**
  Comment: As stated above, REP is against any streamlining, or other strategies that disempower BIPOC and low income communities while empowering for-profit developers who will use whatever advantage conferred to them to build more unaffordable housing.

- **Plan for and dedicate funding to transportation infrastructure improvement to support areas slated for increased housing choice.**
  Comment: What is an area that is “slated for increased housing choice”? This isn’t defined anywhere, but seems to be a euphemism for areas that will be zoned for greater density of market rate housing. In order to build a more equitable city, development along and proximate to transportation infrastructure must be all permanently affordable.

- **Plan and dedicate funding for improved transit services by enhancing operating revenues for the SFMTA.**
  Comment: None

- **Prioritize transit service improvements, such as increasing frequency of service, in Priority Geographies and Environmental Justice Communities to support equitable mobility.**
  Comment: We question the methodology that has targeted this strategy to Priority Geographies.
- Pursue interagency coordination to plan for improvements to transit, pedestrian and bike infrastructure and service, and providing those improvements before housing projects are completed.

Policy VI.3: Advance equitable access to high-quality amenities, and resources as part of a healthy and equitable environment and in parallel with planning for increased housing.

- Plan for community facilities citywide, such as parks, rec centers, schools, libraries in a manner that secures equitable resources in Priority Geographies, Environmental Justice Communities, and areas slated for growth, building on processes such as the Community Facilities Framework, Interagency Plan Implementation Committee.

Comments:
- Access to public parks, rec centers, and schools is essential to a healthy and complete neighborhood. However, this objective is directly countered by the proposed upzonings, removal of density controls, and deregulation of planning’s processes. This is seen for example in the South of Market where housing production is greatly increased, yet there is no concurrent increase in parks, rec centers, school and other necessary amenities. Privately Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS) don’t count as providing "equitable access to high-quality amenities" as BIPOC and low income residents are not in control of how these spaces are designed or used, and either feel excluded or are excluded in practice by the office or luxury housing developments they’re associated with.
- Private development should not be allowed to shadow existing parks, rec center open spaces, or schoolyards.
- Allocating resources for vulnerable communities to pursue and leverage cooperative approaches to entrepreneurship.
- How will "high-quality amenities" be defined? If they are truly "equitable" it would seem that BIPOC and low income communities and the network of cultural districts would define what "high-quality amenities" means.

- Pursue interagency coordination to facilitate planning for and providing equitable access to community facilities.

Comments: No additional comments

Policy VI.4: Advance equitable access to a healthy environment through improved air quality, and resilience to natural hazards and climate change impacts, particularly in Environmental Justice Communities.

Comments: These proposed design standards must incorporate input from BIPOC and low income communities and the network of cultural districts.
Policy VI.5: Apply urban design principles to ensure that new housing enables neighborhood culture, safety, and experience, connects naturally to other neighborhoods, and encourages social engagement and vitality.

Comments:
- David: is making me think about how gentrification works visually, Question about the phrase “The private development process must be opened up and led by communities on the ground. “ and what “open up means”. Who has the power to shape those decisions and how do we broaden up that process, how do we make it as much grass roots as possible
- Hernan: If we think about the Mission, a lot of people have moved out and the current residents are not the same residents who used to be here 5 years ago, they are not the same as the natives. When saying safety is a double edge sword and is usually at the expense of one community. Ex: article on the undocumented community and how if you were undocumented you were worthy of being tortured/suffering, the idea that someone “looks” stereotypically undocumented deems them of mistreatment, so when they say safety what does that mean
- Francisco: how are we structuring ourselves to get our members to be active participants in this process.
- Also discussed - how is “safety” defined and for who when creating urban landscape, who can participate in what spaces given society stereotypes
  a. Urban design should be culturally relevant and responsive to the existing community and cultures.
  b. All aspects of development, including design, should be led by residents and community members. The private development process must be opened up and led by communities on the ground.

Policy VI.6: Sustain the dynamic and unique cultural heritage of San Francisco’s neighborhoods through the conservation of their historic architecture and cultural uses.

Comments:
- a. Cultural districts must be incorporated and supported, including the implementation of the Cultural Heritage, Housing, and Economic Sustainability Strategies (CHHES).  
- b. The city must evaluate policies, plans, developments, and projects against the goals of historic cultural communities, and cultural districts, to ensure that no harm is being inflicted on existing communities.
- c. Intangible cultural heritage and history must also be incorporated as part of the Planning review process.
From: Kimia Haddadan, Housing Element 2022 Update Project Manager
To: The Race & Equity in All Planning Coalition
Date: September 17, 2021

Thank you for your detailed comments on the Draft Housing Element Goals, Policies, and actions, June 8, 2021, and for the chance for an honest and genuine conversation on Tuesday, Sep 14. Our team has thoroughly reviewed your comments and wanted to share our brief reflections on four themes we identified. Please note that your detailed comments will be incorporated into our analysis and synthesis of all public input we have received as part of 22 focus groups, 20+ community conversations, 5-7 housing policy group discussions, and other letters and written comments. Staff will be spending most of September and October analyzing all the detailed input. This process will involve coding the input to identify themes of topics, as well as challenges and needs broken down by various communities of color and vulnerable groups engaged. The input summary report will also include how each theme of input will be incorporated into updates of policies and actions.

We look forward to continuing our conversation with your group, and a genuine collaboration to ensure that we adopt a housing plan truly centered in racial and social equity in 2023.

1. Key priorities for collaboration
   - Equitable distribution of 100% affordable housing
     - “Ensure that there is equitable investment and 100% affordable housing development in all districts, so that certain communities are not at a disadvantage because their neighborhoods don’t get a lot of 100% affordable housing built.”
     - “How can Planning and REP work together to convene strategic meetings with MOHCD to create an aggressive land banking and small sites acquisition program to meet the city's goals for increasing stability and affordability?”
   - Expand local sources of funding
     - “The Low Income Housing Tax Credit program has been devastating for tenants, and has extraordinarily high fixed costs leading to developments needing to be at least 75 units in size before they are financially feasible. This excludes most sites in the city from affordable housing development. In order to expand the possibilities for developing new affordable housing in every neighborhood, we need to generate significant sources of local revenue, and use the LIHTC only on larger sites that yield sufficient units.”
     - “Bonds require ⅔ vote to pass as do other dedicated sources of new revenue. They are worthwhile pursuing, but can be challenging to pass. Designing these revenue measures and prioritizing their uses need to be led by BIPOC and low income communities.”
     - “The budget for permanently affordable housing should be as large as possible (maximum instead of "minimum") in the 10-year Capital Planning.”
   - Targeting infrastructure improvements
     - “Improving infrastructure typically leads to increased land and housing speculation, leading to displacement of BIPOC and low income residents. How will we ensure stability and affordability for existing BIPOC and low income residents so they can be the
beneficiaries of these community improvements? Public investments must be accompanied by strong anti-displacement protections, in order to prevent speculation and gentrification.”

• Increase funding for CBOs serving people of color
  o “We believe a reparations framework is necessary here. This area should also include community development organizations and organizations doing community planning work. Where will this funding come from? Will Planning work with REP, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to identify a revenue generating strategy, or a strategy for allocating existing funds for these purposes? There should be a specific standard for increase in funding, for example, increase funding x10 for these investments”

• Priority Geographies/High Opportunity areas
  o “Avoid policies that concentrate/focus on upzoning, permit streamlining and other development incentives disproportionately in communities of color and low income communities at risk of or facing gentrification and displacement pressures.”
  o “The term Priority Geographies is a term that is “imposed” and has not been thoroughly vetted. It assumes that it includes all and is agreed upon by vulnerable communities.”
  o “Has the community signed off on these priority geographies? What communities and neighborhoods are missing? Why is eliminating displacement limited to priority geographies? How will vulnerable pockets of people outside of priority geographies be protected? Example: Half of the Latino Cultural District is not even covered. Chinatown? Westside?”
  o “Priority Development Areas contradict sensitive communities”
  o “No market rate housing in sensitive communities.”
  o “High Opportunity” is not a competent measure of safety - “Highest Resource” coupled with exempting current UC Berkeley Urban Displacement Project “Sensitive Communities” is an at least improved level of safety to build MR housing.”

Reflection

We agree with many of the comments in the REP letter. We welcome specific and concrete suggestions to be incorporated into the actions to further advance these general comments.

In our meeting on Tuesday (Sep 14) we discussed your concerns about priority geographies and high opportunity areas in depth. Some highlights of our conversations are:

- We agree with the shortcomings of the terminology used for “High Opportunity Areas”. Many of the neighborhoods outside of these areas (and within priority geographies) have valuable community assets and opportunities. We welcome your input on better terminology.
- The purpose of defining these geographies is to advance equity to prioritize investment and resources to communities who have been the target of discrimination for decades. Without prioritizing, equitable outcomes are not easily achievable.
- With the limitations of Fair Housing Law, identifying geographies are the most effective way for advancing equity for communities of color. If we prioritize very large areas, it’s the same as not prioritizing.
- Priority geographies is one of the many geographies we are using. Some policies rely on the Cultural Districts. The draft also recognizes that there are vulnerabilities within high opportunity
areas. For this purpose, the draft includes actions recommending increased investment in anti-
displacement programs in areas undergoing displacement (referring to the UDP displacement 
and gentrification map).

- The High Opportunity Areas is a geography defined by the State, with input from 
equity research leaders such as the Othering and Belonging institute. This is not to say that it is 
an homogenous area, yet still clearly distinct from SoMa or Bayview or Mission. These 
areas match the areas of the city where new housing has not been built, including minimal 
Affordable Housing, and generally align well with historically redlined areas of the city.

- It will not be helpful to polarize our communities. We need to recognize the resources, 
the visions and the possibilities in each area.

- The draft includes actions to continue the production of affordable housing in priority 
geographies, with an emphasis on deeper affordability (See the last bullet for these policies and 
actions). AT THE SAME TIME, The HE recommends targeting units and investments within High 
Opportunity Areas for two main reasons, first to reduce the burden of change resulting from 
concentration of new development in priority geographies (areas with higher concentration of 
low-income households and low-income communities of color), and second to provide housing 
choices for low-income households and people of color to live in neighborhoods with high 
quality amenities (parks, schools, grocery stores, etc).

- Racial and social equity impact analysis: We are starting to scope an analysis of racial and social 
equity impacts of the Housing Element proposed policies and actions. This analysis can look at 
other geographies such as sensitive communities or areas, areas undergoing displacement and 
gentrification, or areas of segregation and exclusion.

- As part of the meetings next step, we agreed to highlight policies and actions that aim to 
prioritize investment to priority geographies, open up housing choices for low-income 
households in High Opportunity Areas, and also recognize the pockets of high displacement 
risks. You can see some of those listed below. We recognize that major policy shifts and 
directions are sometimes buried under many policies and actions and may not be quite clear. 
We aim to bring more clarity to the language in the next draft so that these policy directions are 
identified more clearly and strongly.

  - **Policy III.1 Eliminate community displacement of American Indian, Black, and other 
    People of Color in Priority Geographies.**
    - Action a- Dedicate a minimum budget for permanently affordable housing in 
      Priority Geographies within the 10-year Capital Planning to support funding for 
      planned affordable housing in these areas and with a goal of 50% of RHNA 
      permanently affordable housing targets within the next two cycles (by 2038) in 
      Priority Geographies.

  - **Policy III.2: Expand investments in Priority Geographies to advance equitable access to 
    resources while ensuring community stability.**
    - Action c- Increase funding for community-based organizations serving American 
      Indian, Black, and other People of Color, and Priority Geographies for anti-
      displacement services, such as legal services, code enforcement outreach, tenant 
      counseling, mediation, and housing-related financial assistance.

  - **Policy III.3: Prioritize the City’s acquisition and rehabilitation program to serve Priority 
    Geographies and neighborhoods with higher rates of eviction and displacement.**
- **Action a-** Prioritize purchases for the acquisitions and rehabilitation program that serve extremely low income and unhoused populations.
- **Action b-** Increase capacity building investments for non-profits in neighborhoods on the west side of the city with high rates of evictions and displacement.
  
  **Policy III.8:** Enable low and moderate-income households particularly American Indian, Black, and other People of Color to live and prosper in High Opportunity Neighborhoods through increasing units that are permanently affordable.

  - **Action e-** Establish a goal of dedicating 50 percent of the City’s permanently affordable housing budget within 10-year capital planning cycles for High Opportunity Neighborhoods while dedicating a minimum budget to support funding for planned affordable housing in Priority Geographies.

  **Policy I.6:** Elevate direct rental assistance as a primary strategy to secure housing stability and reduce rent burden.

  - **Action d-** Target this assistance to Vulnerable Groups and those who live in Priority Geographies, and areas with higher rates of displacement.

2. **Inclusive process, accountability, and representation of American-Indian, Black, and other Communities of Color**

   - **“The Housing Element shouldn’t just say that metrics will be developed but actually spell them out following an authentic community vetting process. How will Planning work with REP to create this community-led process?”**
   - **“Who gets to decide who community leaders are? [policy II.2]”**
   - **“We question the legitimacy of appointed advisory bodies that have not been subject to vetting by the community. REP organizations have deep roots in our respective communities and are authentic voices among others to represent the city’s underserved populations. [policy II.2]”**
   - **“The REP coalition has gone to great lengths to include all our various communities and all the stakeholders that are concerned with equity in planning and we are uniquely positioned to represent our own interests. Having a parallel process of seeking representative voices that is carried out by Planning raises serious questions about whether Planning is truly interested in equity or more concerned with a process that they can control. [Policy II.3]”**
   - **“This should be a given but it does relate to oversight of the planning process. This oversight is not defined here but should be the primary means of ensuring accountability to this endeavor, and therefore, the most important aspect of a race and equity policy. If the task of determining milestones and assessing performance is at the discretion of Planning then we are not changing any of the practices that have historically harmed our communities. If Planning’s measuring stick is incremented by microns while ours is incremented by meters, then we have incompatibly different perspectives on outcomes. [policy II.4 measure racial and social equity in planning processes]”**
• “How can REP and Planning work together to create processes that honor the voices and vision of BIPOC and low income communities to determine how these sites are developed?” [with regards to public sites]

Reflection

We were truly touched hearing your intentions for genuine collaboration as stakes are too high to work against each other. As discussed more in depth at our meeting on Tuesday (Sep 14), we appreciate REP’s bringing many community voices together and look forward to working more collaboratively.

Embracing community voices to influence our democratic institutions: We recognize that a limitation of our democracy is that the popular will is not adequately responsive to the needs of marginalized communities including America-Indian, Black, and other communities of color. In order to truly advance racial and social equity, we respond to this limitation by investing in engagement, leadership development, capacity building and partnerships with community organizations in order to amplify the voices of people who might not otherwise be heard - so the City can make better and more just decisions. The goal is to augment the structure to achieve true racial and social equity, rather than replace democratic decision making with an alternative.

Paths to increase accountability- The draft Housing Element would benefit from a much clearer set of proposals for concrete and practical ways that representatives of historically marginalized communities can exert ongoing and meaningful control over Planning Department decisions that will impact their communities. We are seeking new paths or tools to improve accountability for the policies and actions of the Housing Element. This could include more frequent priority setting and monitoring of implementation. We invite REP coalition to engage and shape paths to improve the City’s accountability towards racial and social equity.

3. Addressing private investments

• “Since SF has over-produced market rate housing through the prior RHNA period, the only equity approach would be to focus housing production on 100% affordable strategies. Market rate housing increases housing and land speculation and yields only upward pressure on housing prices.”

• “It is not up to the Planning Department to facilitate construction of market rate housing. Equitable outcomes necessitate the government doing everything it can, mobilizing all resources, to facilitate construction of 100% affordable housing.”

• “#1: The assumption that increasing housing production increases affordability. There is no evidence that this strategy has ever worked. This current policy is not designed to support the city’s current population. Rather, it intends to replace current residents with those who are increasingly affluent.”

• “Comment: Typically, if developers cut their development costs, they don’t pass those savings on in the form of reduced rents or sales prices. Rather, they pocket the difference as profit. If Planning is going to expend city resources to enable cost efficiencies in the development industry, it must demand long term price concessions in return.”

• “As stated above, there should be no “streamlined” approval for market rate housing. This strategy works against equity goals and outcomes.”
• “Streamlining approvals means taking power and agency away from communities, especially
BIPOC and low income communities, and therefore, work directly against racial and social
equity.”
• “No streamlined approval of new market rate housing. No pre-identification of "community
benefits". These should be part and parcel of a project- and not a condition leading to
streamlined approval.”
• “Ministerial review should only be available for 100% affordable housing.” AND “Communities
are not in favor of removing community engagement through state pre-emptions.”
• “Publicly owned sites, regardless of location, must be 100% affordable.” “All publicly owned sites
must be developed as 100% affordable housing. For every public site we sell to a for profit
developer for market rate housing, we will need to purchase new sites at market rate for
affordable housing. This is an incredibly inefficient use of public resources. If the concern is not
having enough money to develop all those affordable housing units, then consider those
developments on large public sites as being phased developments.”
• “Why is affordable housing only focused on "High Opportunity Neighborhoods"? Were these
neighborhoods defined by American Indian, Black and other People of Color? Prioritize 100%
affordable housing throughout San Francisco to achieve desegregation, affordability and
stability.”

Reflection

We discussed more in depth at our meeting on Tuesday (Sep 14), the role of market-based solutions in
the current draft. We are getting many concerns from private developers and City staff about the
limited number of policies focused on private development compared to previous elements.
Out of approximately 50 policies, and 250 actions, the majority focus on affordable housing, supportive
housing, or publicly funded housing programs (tenant protections, supportive services, reparations, etc).
Only 1/3 of policies and actions focus on market-based strategies. Of which, many aim to make market
rate housing affordable to middle-income households. And many of them would also increase
affordable units or reduce their cost of construction. Still, we need to guide private development, how
those investments occur, and who they serve. Other points we wanted to further highlight include:

Legal Requirements- Local jurisdictions are required to comply with RHNA for all income levels. Housing
Element law requires cities to find adequate sites for development for each of those income categories
(including above-moderate) and to remove development constraints for those sites.

Legal consequences for lack of compliance- Failure to have a compliant Housing Element goals and
policies will result in loss of San Francisco’s eligibility for affordable housing funds. Not meeting the
targets under each of the income categories under RHNA to a certain threshold would allow projects to
use SB 35 for ministerial approval. If San Francisco does not accommodate above moderate-income
housing, those projects may become eligible for SB 35 approval.

Preidentified community benefits- We understand the value of community organizing in identifying
community benefits on a project by project basis. We also recognize the costs associated with extended
period of deliberation for each development project. We recognize that the draft policies and actions do
not provide a clear direction on the process. We look forward to your input on how community
organizing, and specifically American-Indian, Black, and other communities of color, can lead processes to define these community benefits. We are seeking new paths or tools to improve accountability for the policies and actions, as well as metrics to evaluate the racial and social equity impacts, for which the discussion of pre-identified community benefits could also be a part of.

**Affordability to Middle-income households**- The draft policies and actions aim to direct privately built housing to serve middle-income or even moderate-income households instead of only targeting high and very high-income households. The draft is considering many ways that this level of affordability could be possible without requiring substantial local funds be spent on maintaining and building back the middle class in San Francisco. Without available State funds for moderate and middle-income households, deed restricted units affordable to moderate and middle-income are quite expensive for the city and could take away funds from building housing for the more vulnerable, low, very-low, and extremely-low income households. The draft Housing Element is seeking strategies to reduce costs of construction, through streamlined approval amongst other ways, while at the same time monitoring to ensure middle-income households are in fact served and/or other identified community benefits are met.

4. **Affordable housing programs, services, and wealth building.**

- “[DALP] Ownership is absolutely essential, for short- and long-term stability. However, the concept of wealth creation through real estate is one of the causes of growing inequality and displacement. Using the DALP and other assistance for BIPOC and low-income San Franciscans to be able to purchase homes will lead to greater long term stability, but we should be prioritizing long term affordability as well- not just for the initial purchaser, but for subsequent owners as well. Then, providing services to help these homeowners build their wealth through means other than through their homes will provide a greater long term benefit for both the homeowners and the community at large.”
- “We do not understand this strategy which is focused solely on homeownership for "the Black community" and "mixed-use buildings".
- “Wealth building through property is one of the reasons we’ve gotten to this point of BIPOC and low income communities being displaced by for-profit development and speculation. We need to start looking at homes as providing stability and anchoring communities. Wealth creation then happens through being paid a decent wage, and not having that wage siphoned off by extraordinary housing costs.
- [supportive housing streamlining, IV.1]"Comment: Communities are not in favor of removing community engagement through state pre-.emptions."
- What about that model [RAD] would help to preserve affordability? Bring in Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs)? That seems unacceptable as it represents a privatization of public housing, the inclusion of private equity, and all the affordability and management problems that LIHTCs Present."
- [ HOPE SF] “Any increases in density on these publicly owned sites should be 100% Affordable"
• “These neighborhood preference programs have not lived up to their promise. Too few neighborhood residents are able to benefit from new affordable housing units.”
• “We should also not be prioritizing master leasing [SROs]. It's a much better investment to purchase SROs to be owned by nonprofits rather than paying master leases to for-profit owners that have no long-term commitment to affordable, stable housing for low income tenants.”
• “There shouldn’t be an expansion of the Senior Operating Subsidy to provide public subsidies to developers. These units should be priced at lower levels so extremely low and very low income seniors can actually afford them.”
• “Instead of focusing resources on emergency shelter, we need to be providing permanent, supportive housing for all.”
• “Rental assistance is great but should not be a "primary strategy" for housing stability or for reducing rent burden. Rental assistance is primarily a way to subsidize landlords’ profits.”

Reflection:

- Community partners representing American Indian, Black, and other communities of color have requested to prioritize many of these programs. For example, homeownership has been strongly emphasized in discussions with American-Indian and Black communities especially as forms of reparations.
- Some of the strategies are necessary as short and mid-term solutions (ex. rental assistance, senior operating subsidy, temporary shelter, master leasing). In the next update, the actions will be tagged in terms of the timeframe so that the longer-term (and often more costly) solutions can be more easily identified.
Hi Kimia,

Since the CGJ report was released in 2019, there have been several BOS meetings supporting the CGJ recommendations that I have submitted comments for, along with comments on the long range expansion plans of UCSF at Parnassus Heights (my public comments on the MOU were submitted to and coordinated by Planning staff), along with numerous comments to the SFPUC commissioners, and published articles. So I have tried my best to make my concerns known in writing.

The issue of connecting pipelines and hydrants and UNLIMITED water to actually allow major fires to be suppressed everywhere in the city and to protect all the new building in the city is never discussed as a topic. There is no overview of how the entire firefighting infrastructure is put together and how it all works: We have 1) the potable water for the little white low pressure hydrants on every block, 2) the non-potable and seawater auxiliary water supply system (AWSS) for the big fat high pressure hydrants - but only in the NE and E Central parts of the city, 3) the developer's infrastructure for auxiliary water delivery, but without adding new water sources to feed into the existing AWSS, 4) developers installing great sprinkler systems without considering where the sprinkler water will come from after an earthquake breaks the supply lines, 5) Parkmerced project is planning on using Lake Merced water for fire fighting -- while the SFPUC and Fire department have declared that all of Lake Merced is to be the primary source of firefighting water for the entire westside (D4, D1, D7) and is planning now on designing the pipeline, 6) Stonestown redevelopment may be looking at Lake Merced too, 7) etc.

I realize this is a large topic involving multiple city departments, but I believe Citywide Planning is the place where this discussion should be held and the updated Housing Element is the vehicle to integrate policies that will be woven together to preserve the city's housing. The Planning Department is structured for multilateral, long range planning and decision making on how to expand (and pay for) our complex infrastructure requirements, not the SFPUC or DPW or the Fire Department. It is old fashioned to task any
single city department with this important responsibility to coordinate our assets to save our future.

Thanks for the links. Let me know if you have other questions.

Best,
Nancy Wuerfel

-----Original Message-----
From: Haddadan, Kimia (CPC) <kimia.haddadan@sfgov.org>
To: Tong, Reanna (CPC) <reanna.tong@sfgov.org>; Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>
Cc: aebocken@gmail.com <aebocken@gmail.com>
Sent: Thu, Jul 8, 2021 4:56 pm
Subject: Re: QUESTION ABOUT Housing Element 2022 Update: Community Conversations

Hi Nancy, my apologies I forgot to include the links, here's what's under Goal VI: https://www.sfhousingelement.org/goal-6
And here's the link for the entire plan: https://www.sfhousingelement.org/first-draft-plan

Let me know if you have any other questions. I'll circle back with you once I connect with the SFPUC staff. Have you connected with them directly on this topic?

From: Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 7, 2021 4:34 PM
To: Haddadan, Kimia (CPC) <kimia.haddadan@sfgov.org>, Tong, Reanna (CPC) <reanna.tong@sfgov.org>
Cc: aebocken@gmail.com <aebocken@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: QUESTION ABOUT Housing Element 2022 Update: Community Conversations

Hi Kimia,

Thanks for your reply. I cannot find the draft plan you refer to anywhere online. Can you please send it to me so that I can review your suggestions?

Next, I attach a copy of the 2019 Civil Grand Jury report that describes the issues around the fires that follow earthquakes. For your convenience, I have copied below some excerpts from the initial pages of the report. The SFPUC is working on some of the CGJ recommendations, but the new Housing Element can play a major role in protecting the city's existing and
future housing by requiring new developments to build access to unlimited seawater sources for firefighting and delivered through expansion of the independent Auxiliary Water Supply System that will not contaminate drinking water mains. As the city grows, so does the need to grow the firefighting infrastructure AND to access the inexhaustable surrounding seawater to protect all of San Francisco. Our potable water stored locally should be reserved for human uses and sanitation.

2010-2019 Civil Grand Jury Report - ACT NOW BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE: AGGRESSIVELY EXPAND AND ENHANCE OUR HIGH-PRESSURE EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING WATER SYSTEM

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY excerpts
San Francisco is one of the most vulnerable cities in the world, and certainly in the United States, to the risk of fire following an earthquake. In 1906, the City suffered tremendous destruction and devastation from the fires that followed a major earthquake. Over 3,000 people died and approximately 28,000 buildings were destroyed. In 1995, the 6.9-magnitude Kobe, Japan earthquake ignited over 100 fires, with several large conflagrations and major fire damage.

We know the question is when, not if, another major earthquake will strike San Francisco and ignite numerous fires.

The Civil Grand Jury believes it is essential that we take prompt and aggressive action to expand and enhance our defenses against the inevitable fires following an earthquake before it is too late. All parts of the City – north and south, east and west, rich and poor, downtown and residential neighborhoods – deserve to be well protected against this catastrophic risk.

Today, the City has a seismically safe high-pressure Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) – separate and distinct from the low-pressure municipal water supply system (MWSS) - that provides excellent firefighting protection to parts of the City. However, large parts of the City, such as the outer Richmond, outer Sunset and Bayview/Hunters Point, among others, do not have a high-pressure AWSS and are not nearly as well protected.

San Francisco is by far the most densely populated large city in California and is the second most densely populated large city in the country. With mostly wood construction in many areas, this dense City remains at significant risk.

B. AWSS BACKGROUND AND CURRENT STATUS excerpts
After the 1906 earthquake and its devastating fires, the City built an independent emergency water supply for firefighting, known as the AWSS. The AWSS is a separate, non-potable
emergency firefighting water supply system that at present consists of approximately 135 miles of high-pressure (HP) pipelines, 230 cisterns, two above-ground storage tanks, a reservoir, and two salt-water pumping stations.

C. PROBLEM STATEMENT excerpts

Certain parts of the City, such as the northeast quadrant, are well protected against the risk of fires following an earthquake. These well-protected areas have a multi-sourced, redundant, Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS), including the HP AWSS. Unfortunately, other parts of the City are protected only by the low-pressure MWSS and by cisterns, which are not. The problem addressed in this report is **how to ensure that all parts of the City – north and south, east and west, rich and poor, downtown and residential neighborhoods – are well protected from fires following earthquakes before it is too late.**

The Civil Grand Jury makes the following recommendations, among others which are more fully discussed herein:

- The City should be prepared to fight fires in all parts of the City in the event of a repeat of a 1906 size earthquake;
- The City should aggressively develop a high-pressure, multi-sourced, seismically safe emergency water supply for those parts of the City that don’t currently have one, with a target completion date of no later than 2034.

Please let me know if I can provide you with more information.

Best,
Nancy Wuerfel

-----Original Message-----
From: Haddadan, Kima (CPC) <kimia.haddadan@sfgov.org>
To: Tong, Reanna (CPC) <reanna.tong@sfgov.org>; Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>
Cc: aeboke@gmail.com <aeboke@gmail.com>
Sent: Wed, Jul 7, 2021 11:39 am
Subject: Re: QUESTION ABOUT Housing Element 2022 Update: Community Conversations

Hi Nancy,

Thanks for your comments and insight on high pressure water pipeline. I will check in with our SFPLC colleagues to expand my understanding on this topic and figure out how we can incorporate policy ideas around this in the Housing Element 2022 Update.

In the meantime. Goal VI in the draft plan is where most of the references to infrastructure
improvements are made, particularly Policy VI.4. Policy VI.2 mostly focused on transportation infrastructure. In our next update we can incorporate references to other infrastructure needed to accompany growth as well.

Many thanks and let me know if you'd like to talk on the phone on this topic further.

best,
Kimia

Kimia Haddadan, Senior Housing Policy Planner
Community Equity Division
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7436 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are available by e-mail, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is encouraged to participate. Find more information on our services here.

From: Tong, Reanna (CPC) <reanna.tong@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, July 2, 2021 10:38 AM
To: Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>
Cc: aeboken@gmail.com <aeboken@gmail.com>; Haddadan, Kimia (CPC) <kimia.haddadan@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: QUESTION ABOUT Housing Element 2022 Update: Community Conversations

Hi Nancy,

My colleague, Kimia (also on this email), would be the best person to respond to your question about Infrastructure in the document. Kimia is out of the office this week and should be able to answer your question or identify other staff on the team to help respond upon her return next week.

Thank you,

Reanna

From: Nancy Wuerfel <nancenumber1@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 2, 2021 10:15 AM
To: Tong, Reanna (CPC) <reanna.tong@sfgov.org>
Cc: aeboken@gmail.com; Haddadan, Kimia (CPC) <kimia.haddadan@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: QUESTION ABOUT Housing Element 2022 Update: Community Conversations
Hi Reanna,

Thank you for this reply. I appreciate your sharing my comments with the team. Can you please tell me now where I can find any reference to INFRASTRUCTURE in the current documents and comments? If you do not have this information, please tell me who I should ask for the INFRASTRUCTURE references.

Many Thanks,

Nancy Wuerfel

-----Original Message-----
From: Tong, Reanna (CPC) <reanna.tong@sfgov.org>
To: Nancy Wuerfel <nancanumber1@aol.com>
Cc: eeboken@gmail.com <eeboken@gmail.com>; Haddadan, Kimia (CPC) <kimia.haddadan@sfgov.org>
Sent: Fri, Jul 2, 2021 9:52 am
Subject: RE: QUESTION ABOUT Housing Element 2022 Update: Community Conversations

Good morning, Nancy,

I’ve shared your comments with the rest of the Housing Element team to note down and consider how to incorporate them into the Housing Element Update. We do appreciate you taking the time to share them with us.

Best regards,
Reanna

---
From: Nancy Wuerfel <nancanumber1@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 1, 2021 11:23 AM
To: Tong, Reanna (CPC) <reanna.tong@sfgov.org>
Cc: eeboken@gmail.com
Subject: QUESTION ABOUT Housing Element 2022 Update: Community Conversations

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Tong,

I am a member of SPEAK. You have asked for input from us. I cannot find ANY reference to the meaning of and plan for "increased resources for INFRASTRUCTURE to advance racial and social equity" in the updated Housing Element. You mention it in your outreach letter, and that is the last I have seen on this topic - see statement below.

Please send me the exact wording anywhere in your documents and the context in which INFRASTRUCTURE is defined and what it means for this
revision.

I will be very clear on why I ask you for these details. The Housing Element MUST include reference to having sufficient INFRASTRUCTURE to deliver water to fight fires to any large development of housing. NO! The SFPUC is not requiring citywide INFRASTRUCTURE to provide additional underground high pressure pipelines for unlimited non-potable water from seawater to be delivered to these new developments to fight fires. Without new auxiliary water supply lines being built, all new housing is subject to catastrophic fires following earthquakes and other major ignitions such the recent SOMA fires at 14th Street.

Clearly, the purpose of the Housing Element is to provide housing. Building housing without PRESERVING this housing is a false promise to improve people's housing. We live in earthquake country, surrounded by four major EQ faults, and surrounded by unlimited seawater which is NOT currently protecting the southern and western neighborhoods from major fires. This means that there is NO racial and social equity in these unprotected neighborhoods without the SAME level of unlimited auxiliary water protection and infrastructure as is in the eastern and northern parts of the city!

Please do not pass the buck off to any other city department to protect housing from destruction by fires because the PLANNING HOUSING ELEMENT failed to require equal access to unlimited water for fire protection via underground high pressure pipelines to the entire city. YES! This is the Housing Element is the correct vehicle to ensure that housing built is also housing protected from fires.

Please add my comments to the official responses from the public. If I can provide you with any additional information, please let me know.

- Increase resources within Priority Geographies for acquisition and rehabilitation, tenant protections, homeownership, community facilities and infrastructure to advance racial and social equity.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wuerfel
SUNSET/PARKSIDE DISTRICT
From: MPIC - Zoning & Planning Committee
To: Tong, Reanna (CPC)
Cc: Miraloma Park Improvement Club; Joan van tin
Subject: 2022 Draft Housing Element Response from the Miraloma Park Improvement Club Zoning and Planning Committee
Date: Tuesday, August 17, 2021 11:10:29 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Reanna,

On behalf of the Zoning and Planning Committee of the Miraloma Park Improvement Club, I'm submitting our response (pasted below) to the 2022 Draft Housing Element. Please let me know if you have questions and if we can be of help.

Best regards,

Karen Breslin, Chair
Zoning and Planning Committee
Miraloma Park Improvement Club
350 O'Shaughnessy Boulevard
San Francisco, CA 94127
www.miralomapark.org

Miraloma Park Improvement Club Zoning and Planning Committee Comment Re: the 2022 Draft Housing Element 6 Policies

The Zoning and Planning Committee of the Miraloma Park Improvement Club appreciates the considerable effort made by the Planning Department to engage San Franciscans in the 2022 Housing Element development process. In attempting to redress housing inequities in San Francisco, the 6 Policies of the Draft 2022 Housing Element align with current social justice imperatives.

But because the Policies’ appropriateness to govern planning decisions depends upon implementation, without understanding the specific ways in which the Policies might result in changes both in the Planning Code and in Planning Department practices, it is difficult to comment meaningfully on them. We note, however, that the comments on the 6 Policies submitted by the Racial Equity in Planning Coalition (REIPC) raise many helpful points and questions regarding implementation and could serve as guideposts for further consideration of the Policies to the benefit of the City as a whole. MPIC concurs especially with the following REIPC responses:

- Draft Housing Element Policies should promote significantly increased construction of affordable, low income, and supportive housing via increased reliance on non-profit housing organizations and decreased reliance on for-profit developers and via engaging in multi-department collaboration to identify suitable sites.
- Low income communities/communities of color should determine who represents their interests and should have a major voice in determining policies affecting their communities.
- Streamlining or other strategies disempower low-income communities and communities of color, while empowering for-profit developers. [These strategies have the potential to exclude all communities from planning decisions impacting them.]
- All neighborhoods must benefit from high quality design.
- REIPC opposes policies that promote up-zoning, permit streamlining, and other development incentives disproportionately in communities of color and low income communities at risk of or facing gentrification and displacement pressures. [Such policies can dramatically alter neighborhood environments without allowing meaningful community input.]
- Access to public parks, recreation centers, and schools is essential to a healthy and complete neighborhood. REIPC finds this objective to be directly countered by the proposed up-zonings, removal of density controls, and deregulation of planning’s processes.
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BACKGROUND

The Housing Element 2022 Update (2022 Update) is San Francisco’s first housing plan that is centered on racial and social equity. It will include policies and programs that express the city’s collective vision and values for the future of housing in San Francisco. This plan will identify priorities for decision makers, guide resource allocation for housing programs and services, and define how and where the city should create new homes for San Franciscans, or those who want to call this city home. This plan will need to accommodate the creation of 82,000 units by 2031, a target set by State and Regional Agencies that has been tripled compared to the city’s current targets.

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) requires that each City prepares a housing plan every eight years, and it is a requirement to be eligible for state affordable housing funds. The plan preparation is led by the Planning Department in coordination with multiple city agencies, and the resulting General Plan element will be a legislated document adopted by the Board of Supervisors and signed into Ordinance. It does not change land use controls or zoning and does not allocate budget but would guide or direct those decisions.

The 2022 Update is a significant update to the existing element that was updated in 2014 because:

- The City has clear commitment to advance racial and social equity in San Francisco.
- The City is shifting towards small and mid-rise housing for our diverse communities across all neighborhoods, particularly along transit corridors.
- San Francisco’s share of Regional Housing Needs Allocation targets have increased from 25,000 units (2014-2022) to 82,000 units (2023-2031).
- New State laws require local jurisdictions to Affirmatively Furthering the Fair Housing through:
Addressing exclusion and discrimination
Creating housing access in high resource neighborhoods
Bringing opportunity to segregated and underserved neighborhoods

- New State laws also require local jurisdictions to address environmental justice through incorporating environmental justice policies to address the unique or compounded health risks.

Since the last update, the Planning Department pursued multiple initiatives that evaluated and analyzed housing needs and strategies in collaboration with community partners. In May 2020, SF Planning launched the public process for the Housing Element Update 2022 with a summary of key ideas informed by these initiatives. This public process is one of the most substantial community outreach and engagement processes led by the Department to date. Three phases of community outreach and engagement have since been completed.

To date, the Department has provided informational updates on the progress of shaping this plan at the following Planning Commission hearings:

May 28, 2020 Kick-off Phase I outreach and release of key ideas from recent housing initiatives
Apr 22, 2021 Kick-off of Phase II outreach and release of Draft 1 2022 Update
Oct 14, 2021 Preliminary findings from Phase II outreach
Jan 27, 2022 Kick-off of Phase III outreach and release of Draft 2 2022 Update

This memo contains information about: (1) the purpose of the hearing; (2) the Housing Element documents, which includes the housing plan and the supporting reports; (3) a summary of Phase III public input and corresponding revisions to the 2022 Update policies and actions.

1. Purpose of the hearing

The hearing on April 7, 2022 will be the fifth informational hearing on this project at the Planning Commission. The purpose of this hearing is to present (1) findings from Phase III and final round of outreach and engagement, (2) draft 3 of goals, objectives, policies, and actions, and (3) key findings from supporting reports.

2. Housing Element Documents

The following documents are required as part of the State Law requirements for housing elements, including:

- **Housing Element 2022 Update, Draft 3**: The city’s housing plan including goals, objectives, policies and actions.
- **Housing Needs Assessment and Assessment of Fair Housing**: The report includes detailed data and analysis of San Francisco’s population and employment trends; existing housing characteristics; equity analysis including displacement, fair housing, and environmental justice challenges; and overall housing needs, including special needs groups.
- **Sites Inventory Report and Rezoning Program**: The report identifies specific sites or parcels that are

---

1 Senate Bill 1000, passed in 2016
available for residential development or are in the process of being made available (i.e. planned) for residential uses via rezones or specific plans.

- **Analysis of Government and Non-Government Constraints Report:** The report provides an analysis of potential and actual governmental and non-governmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including zoning, the availability of financing, the price of land, and the cost of construction.

- **Evaluation of 2014 Housing Element Report:** The evaluation provides an assessment of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the objectives, policies, implementation the programs listed in the 2014 Housing Element.

- **General Plan Consistency Analysis and Draft Amendments:** The memo outlines the 2022 Update’s consistency with the other elements of the San Francisco General Plan and outlines any General Plan updates to other elements that may be required to maintain consistency amongst all policies.

Publications of these required reports on March 25th serves as a 30-day notice required by State Law to seek public input on the contents of these reports. After this public input period, the Department will submit these reports along with the Draft 3 of goals, objectives, policies, and actions to HCD for their first review. The attached Housing Element 2022 Update Highlight includes a brief summary of the findings from each of the documents listed above.

3. **Outreach and Engagement**

**Overview of Engagement Process: three phases**

The engagement process for the 2022 Update incorporates three phases of outreach and engagement. After vetting key ideas with the community in Phase I, the project team reviewed draft housing policy and related actions with residents, community and government leaders, and housing experts and advocates in Phase II. During Phase III of outreach and engagement, the project team demonstrated how community input was reflected in revised policy and further refined critical ideas such as the reparative framework for housing.

- May- Dec 2020 Phase I outreach – Vetting Key Ideas with the Community
- Apr- Sep 2021 Phase II outreach – Refining Policies Together
- Jan- Mar 2022 Phase III outreach – Refining Policies & Verifying Public Input Findings

Outreach moving forward will focus on sharing information about the draft 2022 Update content and adoption process and facilitating discussions with community and government leaders to prepare for its implementation. Methods of outreach have included:

- 20+ focus groups with vulnerable populations co-hosted or co-facilitated by community-based organizations
- 65+ community hosted community conversations, listening sessions, and presentations
- 2 Housing Policy Group discussion series (12 meetings total), including representatives of 27 organizations
- 4 Planning Commission and 2 Historic Preservation Commission hearings
- Online input through the Digital Participation Platform, along with informational tools such as policy
navigation tools

- A survey administered online and in person, completed by 1,631 respondents

Figure: Phase I and II Outreach and Engagement Map and List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II Community Conversations</th>
<th>Phase II Focus Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Commission*</td>
<td>Latino Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAP 2020</td>
<td>Latino Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMA Planning 101</td>
<td>SF Youth Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MOHCD Working Group*</td>
<td>Larkin Street Youth Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
<td>Senior &amp; Disability Action*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>District 10 CBO</td>
<td>MegaBlack*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>St. Francis CAC</td>
<td>Mo'MAGIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>District 1 Townhall</td>
<td>Tenderloin People's Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Richmond Community Coalition</td>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SPUR Digital Discourse</td>
<td>HRC Roundtable*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Housing Element Overview*</td>
<td>HRC Roundtable*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>District 4 Virtual</td>
<td>OMI Community Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Bayview-Hunter’s Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sunset Forward</td>
<td>Planning Association for the Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sunset Forward</td>
<td>North Beach Neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sunset Forward</td>
<td>Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SF YIMBY*</td>
<td>Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MOHCD*</td>
<td>Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tenderloin Housing Clinic La Voz Latina</td>
<td>Cayuga Neighborhood Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
<td>Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>English Listening Session*</td>
<td>SF League of Conservation Voters*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>District 7*</td>
<td>SF YIMBY*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>Open Door Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Spanish Listening Session*</td>
<td>SPUR*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Richmond Senior Center*</td>
<td>Building Trade Public Policy Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chinese Listening Session*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Spanish Listening Session*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fillmore/Western Addition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>District 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>HEARD*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>HEARD*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*groups that reach a multi-neighborhood or citywide audience

The Department published detailed summaries of public input for each of the first two phases and they can be found here: Phase I Summary https://www.sfhousingelement.org/phase-i-public-input-summary and Phase II Summary https://www.sfhousingelement.org/phase-ii-public-input-summary

This memo also serves as the input summary report for phase III of outreach and engagement, which completes the three phases of community outreach and engagement for the Housing Element 2022 Update.

**Overview of Phase III outreach and engagement**

Phase III of public outreach and engagement began in January 2022 with the publication of Draft 2 and the Phase II Public Input Summary. After informational hearings at the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions, staff reached out to community partners from Phase II to ask them for assistance in verifying our analysis of the public input that they helped to gather and reviewing the policy refinements that were drafted in response to their community's input. Staff also reached out to organizations that had either hosted previous community conversations or expressed interest in learning about the Housing Element.

Staff targeted Phase III outreach to groups and individuals that were not as well represented in previous efforts, including community members working or residing in SoMa and Chinatown, and community members identifying as or working with transgender people, public housing residents, and organized labor. Staff also continued to prioritize engagement with American Indian and Black community leaders and organizations. In total, nearly 60 organizations were actively recruited for engagement, resulting in 15 community presentations and/or discussions and several interviews. Most events were structured as project updates and targeted policy discussions. Staff also conducted one additional Chinese language focus group with Chinatown residents living with families in Single Room Occupancy hotels in order to fill a gap in direct knowledge from this key demographic group.

**Groups engaged during Phase III:**

1. African American Reparations Committee
2. African American Reparations Committee - Economic Empowerment Sub-Committee
3. All Cultural District Meeting
4. American Indian Cultural District
5. BMAGIC
6. Chinatown Focus Group with SRO Families
7. District 4 Youth & Families Network
8. Excelsior Collaborative
9. Japantown Land Use Committee
10. Latino Task Force
11. MegaBlack
12. REP Coalition
13. Richmond Service Organizations
14. SF Labor Council
15. SoMa Pilipinas Filipino Cultural District
16. Tenderloin People's Congress

**Overview of Commission Comments**

At the January Planning Commission hearing, commissioners expressed a desire to see more measurable goals, and clearer direction on how to achieve the city’s RHNA targets, including how to secure adequate funding. Commissioners asked for more specifics to clarify the nature of proposed streamlining measures and how the plan would comply with state laws. The commission discussed the need for transportation improvements and adequate community services to keep pace with densification of the west side. The commission also discussed
how the department would transition from building the housing plan to implementing the housing plan. The commission expressed some concerns that the plan is too aspirational and that it needs to be grounded in the constraints created by the existing housing market and funding structures. Further details related to commissioner comments are highlighted under each topic below.

At the February Historic Preservation Commission hearing, commissioners expressed that the racial and social equity lens is essential and wanted to see related policies related to repairing the harms of government discrimination prioritized. They also wanted to see added specificity to policies related to advocacy, accountability, housing cost stabilization, and community empowerment as well as more specificity on implementation processes. There was support for the inclusive and holistic approach to housing, recognizing its role in social and cultural connection. They expressed interested in learning more specifics about how communities will be protected from displacement.

**Phase III Public Input and Corresponding Draft 3 Revisions**

Below staff has provided summarized key public input by theme and noted how Draft 3 responds to the input. Please refer to the attached Revised Policy and Action Table for a full accounting of how the draft changed between January and March.

**Reparations Framework**

**Public Input:**

One of the key topics discussed during Phase III was how to strengthen the 2022 Update’s ability to advance reparations for communities and groups impacted by discriminatory government action. This topic has been an important theme in many conversations with stakeholders throughout the project, including both commissions, and it was discussed at length with the following stakeholders during Phase III: American Indian Cultural District; African American Reparations Committee; MegaBlack community convening; Dream Keeper Initiative staff at MOHCD; and Human Rights Commission staff.

A significant concern amongst these stakeholders about the reparations framing in Draft 2 was the fact that it applied only to homeownership programs, which would likely create a barrier for low-income households who would not qualify for loans. Some participants also pointed out that not every household is interested in homeownership and that there should be a form of reparations offered to renters as well. Others pointed out that high-income households may also be excluded from this program and that income level should not determine if a person is eligible for reparations. Some participants, such as the American Indian Cultural District, argued for a universal priority being created for their community members in all housing assistance programs in order to rectify the unfulfilled obligations of the government to assist American Indians as part of the 1950s relocation program. They also recommended framing the “dedication” of land to American Indians as cited under Policy 12 in a more culturally humble manner and distinguishing between the nature of reparative acts for their community versus others harmed by discriminatory government actions. Some committee members and community members from the Reparations Committee convenings suggested that the Housing Element should advocate for reparations that go beyond direct housing assistance to include freedom from local property taxes, streamlined business application or developer application review, or the donation of land to impacted communities for community-directed development.

Through these discussions, stakeholders also distinguished between reparative actions that are intended to directly redress harm to an individual or community and actions that are intended to correct systems that
maintain or exacerbate the racial disparities that have resulted from previous discriminatory actions. Draft 2, Policy 5 was an example of this latter type of reparative action, which was intended to address the disparities in allocation of below market rate (BMR) units but that did not argue that programmatic changes were necessary to provide a direct for of repair to impacted communities. Similarly, Draft 2, Policy 12 was intended to address the disproportionate displacement of communities impacted by government discrimination; however, it did not directly frame those actions as reparations. Some stakeholders also recommended that housing need should be addressed in actions calling for reparative actions, with higher priority assigned to higher need candidates. For example, one interviewee suggested that reparative programs should prioritize the unhoused or marginally housed Black San Francisco population before San Francisco residents that are housed but need assistance in securing market-rate housing or former San Francisco residents who are currently housed outside of the city.

**Draft 3 Revisions:**

Policies related to a reparations framework in the Final Draft were expanded to policies 5 and 12 so that more people within communities directly harmed by government discrimination could benefit, including lower-income households seeking homeownership assistance and households seeking below market rate rental units. These communities will also generally benefit by directing investment to cultural anchors and increasing access to culturally significant land and spaces.

Under Policy 5, the city would now create and pilot programs to increase access to below market rate units for harmed communities and would expand and fund community capacity for housing programs and investments for American Indian residents, in addition to previous actions. Under Policy 11, regarding homeownership, the city would now seek to reduce income eligibility as a barrier to access homeownership for harmed communities, would extend the homeownership program for Black communities to other harmed communities upon completion of the pilot, and would prioritize American Indian residents for housing opportunities. And, under Policy 12, the city would now identify opportunities to restore access to land for traditional cultural uses and to invest in spaces for the American Indian community to participate in traditional cultural practices and convene community gatherings, would identify opportunities to donate or dedicate land for use by Black-led, community-serving organizations, and would fund the development of cultural spaces that serve harmed communities.

**Housing Access, Quality, and Choice**

**Public Input:**

Improving access to safe and dignified housing that meets the specific needs of people of color, seniors, people with disabilities, families, immigrants, LGBTQ+ people and other vulnerable groups was another area of concern that stakeholders continued to elevate. This was echoed by both commissions. The department received approximately 30 messages through the online portal from individuals associated with Golden Gate Regional Center asking that the needs of people with disabilities be centered in the draft plan. Staff also heard from stakeholders with families living in Chinatown SRO hotels about the specific needs of their community (language access, adequate public transportation, deep affordability, access to childcare and schools, access to cultural services and institutions) and how this severely limits their housing choices to areas in proximity to Chinatown where their daily needs are best served. Stakeholders at the Latino Task Force convening also spoke to the struggles their community faces in accessing the housing lottery due to application criteria that create barriers for applicants with no credit or banking history, with seasonal or intermittent income, or with intergenerational households. And they also spoke about the need for increased neighborhood preferences to allow residents to remain in the neighborhood while accessing BMR units.
The American Indian Cultural District cited similar difficulties for their community and recommended that agencies should address program access barriers by increasing city agency staff presence in communities to share program information and report on progress towards meeting community specific needs. The cultural district and other stakeholders advocated for increased support for community-based organizations that provide housing stability support with cultural humility, and they spoke about the need for centralized and consolidated resource hubs where a person could access a range of housing information and assistance. The district and other stakeholders also spoke to the need for more housing types that meet the needs of multi-generational households that have space and amenities for children, working-age adults, seniors and persons with disabilities. Similarly, stakeholders pointed out that it can be a barrier to accessing affordable housing if one is applying as a multi-generational household. Regarding the needs of families, SRO residents in Chinatown and others have spoken of the need for affordable housing with adequate space and amenities for children.

Lastly, Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI) staff provided feedback on the specific needs of transgender and LGBTQ+ people in safely accessing housing assistance and underscored that transgender people often experience multiple layers of vulnerability based on race, income, limited access to medical care, lack of documentation, lack of familial support, and other factors. For these reasons, OTI staff advocated for more specific actions to support housing for the transgender community.

**Draft 3 Revisions:**
On balance, policies and actions in Draft 3 were revised to increase the specificity of actions and to better describe certain barriers to housing, such as lack of documentation for immigrants or transgender people. Globally, when the plan previously called for programs or resources to be directed to “areas vulnerable to displacement” the plan now calls includes “populations and areas...”. Under Policy 5, staff expanded actions related to Certificates of Preference (COP) to study COP holders needs and preferences. Under Policy 7, aimed at increasing investments in permanently affordable housing that are specific to neighborhoods that serve as entry points to recently arrived residents, an action was added “to study and identify programs and building types that respond to the needs of recently arrived immigrants to incorporate into permanently affordable housing investments that are concentrated in the neighborhoods in which they initially settle, such as Chinatown, the Tenderloin, the Mission, and other gateway neighborhoods,” recognizing that location can be more critical for the safety and success of these populations than for others.

Several actions were added to increase housing access for transgender people in recognition of the severe disparities in housing access and safety experienced by this group and their safety and discrimination concerns with access existing systems. Under Policy 8, an action was added to support the San Francisco Ending Trans Homelessness Plan to end homelessness for transgender people. Under Policy 9, policies were added to expand short term medical recovery housing programs for unhoused transgender people so that transgender people can access medical care that requires stable housing and to allocate resources to population-specific programs outside of the Homelessness Response System.

Lastly, the specific needs of low-income families in housing type and assistance were further addressed under Policy 27 to prioritize the construction of housing that supports multi-generational living and under Policy 28 to establish programs to assist in relocate them from SROs and overcrowded living conditions.

**Accountability**
Public Input:
The need to increase accountability and to clarify actions intended to achieve this objective arose in many discussions with stakeholders in Phase III. Stakeholders at the convenings hosted by the African American Reparations Committee, MegaBlack, Latino Task Force, the District 4 Youth and Families Network, the REP Coalition and others noted that there is a lack of trust in the government's willingness or ability to implement the draft policies and that a clear structure for accountability to communities and oversight of decision making are necessary. This was supported by requests for key milestones and metrics to measure how the city is serving vulnerable communities. Stakeholders also spoke to the need to acknowledge existing community-led planning initiatives, such as MAP2020 or Sunset Forward, and follow through on related city commitments. District 4 residents, Richmond residents, the American Indian Cultural District and others were especially eager to understand the funding needs and mechanisms required to meet the policies regarding increased production of affordable housing. This echoed input from the Planning Commission at the January hearing to include more measurable goals and how policies, such as those calling for new funding advocacy, will result in the increase in funds required to meet the need.

Draft 3 Revisions:
On balance, policies and actions in Draft 3 were revised to increase the specificity of actions. The department also aims to define potential targets or performance outcomes that San Francisco should expect to include for each of its key housing programs in the Racial and Social Equity analysis of the Housing Element and then to incorporate those into the draft prior to adoption. This analysis also aims to provide benchmarks for anti-displacement investments, such as determining the total number of permanently affordable housing units that would need to be created or preserved to offset or mitigate involuntary displacement for low- and moderate-income households caused by future housing production or infrastructure improvements, of certain size or scope.

Specific actions were added or strengthened under Policy 14 in response to public input. Actions call for the city to "identify and fund liaisons to support the housing needs and priorities of American Indian, Black, and other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities within key City agencies such as MOHCD, and Planning; such liaison should provide regular check-ins with community at centralized community spaces and reporting on program performance." Actions also call for the inter-agency Housing Element implementation committee to convene equity-focused community bodies, such as the African American Reparations Committee, the Community Equity Advisory Council, or Cultural Districts, to inform reporting and decision-making related to the city's budgets and workplans for housing equity. The goals of these changes are multifold: to empower community voices in decision-making; to increase transparency in resource allocation decisions; to increase communities' access to city staff and decision-makers; to increase staff's awareness of on-the-ground community conditions and needs; and to provide overall better information, coordination, and service to communities that have been historically marginalized in government processes.

Implementation (Rezoning, Streamlining and Demolition)
Public Input:
The need to clarify actions related to critical areas of implementation, including rezoning, streamlining, and demolition review, arose in discussions with stakeholders in Phase III. The Planning Commission, Labor Council representatives, market-rate and affordable housing developers, and others also wanted to hear more specifically how streamlining would be achieved and how residential demolition review may change to facilitate necessary development on the westside. Residential developers expressed the significant risk associated with
additional time and uncertainty in the entitlement and permitting process and how it burdens housing projects. They stressed that long and unpredictable timeframes towards Planning entitlement and permitting beyond Planning added considerable risk and costs that increase the need for higher returns on housing units, exacerbating the output of housing units oriented towards top earners. Recommendations included increasing ministerial permitting and allowing it through local programs, reducing conditional use authorizations by focusing their need for unique conditions rather than common processes like residential demotion, lot consolidation, and use changes towards residential; reducing discretionary actions around subjective processes like design guidelines in favor of objective standards; and revising CEQA review to be more like how it is implemented in other Bay Area municipalities where less triggers high levels of analysis. They also suggested continued streamlining and consolidation of interagency reviews to avoid conflicts and delays. Broader land use changes included elimination of lot-based density requirements in favor of form-based zoning.

**Draft 3 Revisions:**

With the analysis afforded by the *Housing Needs Assessment and Assessment of Fair Housing, Sites Inventory Report and Rezoning Program,* and *Analysis of Government and Non-Government Constraints Report,* the department determined that rezoning would be necessary to ensure capacity that will meet San Francisco’s RHNA targets while affirmatively furthering fair housing. Therefore, Policy 20 now calls for a rezoning program that increases the opportunity for mid-rise multi-family buildings along transit corridors, allows increased density through formed-based zoning for small multi-family buildings near transit throughout Well-Resourced Neighborhoods.

The plan has also been revised to create more clarity about the nature of streamlining measures intended to facilitate affordable housing and community serving development. Policy 19 includes actions to reduce costs of building permanently affordable housing by minimizing project-by-project outreach and engagement and expanding ministerial review for smaller parcels. Policy 25 actions would reduce development constraints by reducing neighborhood notification requirements where community-informed community benefits are provided, allowing Department approval instead of Planning Commission approvals for increased affordability, or through CEQA streamlining or ministerial approval with adoption of Housing Sustainability Districts within Well-resourced Neighborhoods outside of areas vulnerable to displacement. This policy would also support low-income homeowners by reducing review and notification requirements of the Planning Code for small permits such as rear additions or small expansions.

Recognizing that some demolition will be necessary to create more multi-family housing, Policy 26 actions would remove conditional use processes for demolition single-family or multi-unit buildings that are not tenant occupied and without history of tenant evictions, that are not a historic resource, and where units are proposed to increase. It would also create objective regulations that prohibit demolition of tenant occupied units, unless the number of units is increasing by at least 200%, tenants are provided with full relocation compensation, replacement units are offered to tenants at the same rental rate prior to demolition and comply with State Law to replace any affordable or rent-controlled units demolished with permanently affordable units at equivalent affordability rates.

**Geographic Approaches to Policy**

**Public Input:**

Staff received additional input about the various geographical approaches to housing policies described in the draft plan. Stakeholders at the District 4 meeting expressed uncertainty that the policies targeted for Well-
Resourced Neighborhoods would be sufficient to direct sufficient affordable housing production to those areas. And the REP Coalition expressed concerns with how Priority Equity Geographies and Well-resourced Neighborhoods are defined, who is left out, and what is allowable within these geographies. They felt that these geographies may pit communities against each other, and that vulnerable communities should be leading these conversations about how to address housing needs in their communities.

Draft 3 Revisions:
On balance, policies and actions in Draft 3 were not revised to change any proposed geographical framing. Policy 18 was modified to ensure that Cultural Districts overlapping with Priority Equity Geographies were incorporated when tailoring zoning changes to these areas and the needs of American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Given that the geographies have been reviewed throughout community engagement phases II and III, and the fact that the plan includes policies that call for community empowerment in zoning change decisions in Priority Equity Geographies and increased accountability to communities of color and vulnerable groups regardless of location, the department believes that the plan adequately address the desire to ensure vulnerable communities’ opportunities to shape future housing legislation, zoning and development projects. Furthermore, the plan also includes policies related to the Displacement and Gentrification map and the Cultural Districts geographies, which allows it to better target anti-displacement policies.

Displacement
Public Input:
Several stakeholders continue to express concern about the plan’s ability to stop involuntary displacement. The REP Coalition recommended changing policies 20 and 26, as they were viewed as promoting gentrification, displacement, and evictions through expansion of market-rate rate housing through rezoning, and height and density increases.

Draft 3 Revisions:
Policy 21 anticipates the potential displacement pressures that could be created by zoning changes, development projects and infrastructure projects, and it requires that the city “identify levels of investments to prevent displacement according to the needs of each community and each neighborhood” based on the forthcoming Racial and Social Equity Analysis of the plan. Staff heard the concerns about Policy 21 being vague and has attached the Draft Scope of Work for Racial and Social Equity Analysis of the Housing Element 2022 Update that will bring more specificity to the anti-displacement measures necessary for implementation of this plan.

Summary of Final Draft 2022 Housing Element Policies Revisions
In brief, Draft 3 of the 2022 Update:

- Expanded the reparations framework to include not only homeownership programs but also the allocation of below market units, investment in cultural anchors and access to land, while adding more actions intended to redress the impacts of discriminatory government actions.
- Increased the number of actions related in improving transparency and accountability in housing distribution and management systems, including the inter-agency Housing Element implementation committee’s engagement with equity-focused community bodies and designation of community liaisons at key agencies such as Planning and MOHCD.
• Refined policies intended to increase the quality, variety, and distribution of affordable housing accessible to vulnerable populations such as seniors, people with disabilities, transgender and LGBTQ+ people, transitional aged youth, immigrants, and others.
• Clarified that a rezoning program is necessary to create adequate capacity for additional mid-rise and small multi-family housing types in Well-resourced Neighborhoods to meet the requirements of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.
• Clarified the nature of streamlining measures that may be taken to reduce development constraints that lead to improved housing affordability and choice or to support low-income homeowners in rehabilitating or expanding their homes.
• Clarified policy direction on preservation and demolition of existing housing.

NEXT STEPS AND ADOPTION SCHEDULE
This third draft will be sent to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for their review and comments along with the supporting reports. Publications of these required reports on March 25th serves as a 30-day notice required by State Law to seek public input on the contents of these reports. After this public input period, the Department will submit these reports along with the Draft 3 of goals, objectives, policies, and actions to HCD for their first review. The Department is also embarking on a Racial and Social Equity Impact analysis for the Housing Element policies. The draft Environmental Impact Report is scheduled to be published on April 20, 2022, and the corresponding hearing at the Planning Commission will be held on June 9, 2022. An initiation hearing for the General Plan Amendment will be scheduled for the Planning Commission in Fall 2022, followed by adoption hearing and certification of EIR in January 2023. The State mandate for a fully adopted Housing Element in San Francisco is May 2023. Failure to meet this deadline has significant implications for affordable housing funds, as well as potential significant fines, as outlined in the next section.

In sum, the following key dates must be met:

• Mar 25 – Apr 30, 2022: Minimum 30-day public review of Draft 3 goals, objectives, policies, and actions and supporting reports
• Apr 20, 2022: Draft Environmental Impact Report Publication
• May 10, 2022: Submittal to HCD for minimum 90-day review period from HCD with comments expected in the summer
• Jun 9, 2022: Draft Environmental Impact Report Planning Commission Informational Hearing
• Now – Sep, 2022: Racial and Social Equity Impact Analysis
• Fall 2022: Second submittal to HCD for review with comments expected within 90 days; Initiation hearing for the General Plan Amendment
• Dec 31, 2022: Expiration of 2014 Housing Element, beginning the 120-day grace period for Housing Element adoption and HCD certification of 2022 Update
• Jan 2023: Adoption hearing for 2022 Update and certification of EIR
• May 2023: State deadline for a fully adopted Housing Element 2022 Update
Consequences of Failure to Comply with the State Law

In April 2021, California’s Housing and Community Development (HCD) department issued guidance to cities and counties about the consequences of falling short in adopting or otherwise complying with previously adopted housing elements. HCD is authorized “to review any action or failure to act by a local government (that it finds) inconsistent with an adopted housing element or housing element law. This includes failure to implement program actions included in the housing element. HCD may revoke housing element compliance if the local government’s actions do not comply with state law.” And because housing elements are a mandatory part of a city or county’s General Plan, a noncompliant housing element could also impact its General Plan, potentially invalidating it as well. Localities in this situation are subject to a range of penalties or consequences, including loss of affordable housing and transportation funds as well as:

- **Legal Suits and Attorney Fees**: Local governments with noncompliant housing elements are vulnerable to litigation from housing rights’ organization, developers, and HCD.

- **Loss of Permitting Authority**: Courts may suspend the locality’s authority to issue building permits or grant zoning changes, variances, or subdivision map approvals.

- **Financial Penalties**: Courts can fine jurisdictions up to $100,000 per month, and if they are not paid, multiply that by a factor of six.

- **Court Receivership**: Courts may appoint an agent with all powers necessary to remedy identified housing element deficiencies.

- **Streamlined Ministerial Approval Process**: Non-compliant jurisdictions are now subject to less rigorous “ministerial” approvals in order to hasten the production of housing.

Related Efforts

The Housing Element 2022 Update will initiate a holistic update to the General Plan. The Housing Element update is one part of a series of proposed amendments to the General Plan intended to modernize the City's
land use policy document. The other updates underway include updates to the Safety and Resilience Element to add climate resilience, a complete update of the Transportation Element consistent with the interagency ConnectSF Program, and an incorporation of Environmental Justice policies into the General Plan, consistent with both state law and the Commission’s equity resolution number 20738.

**Required Commission Action**

This item is being presented for informational purposes only. No formal action by the Planning Commission is required.

**Recommendation:**  None – Informational Item Only

**Attachments:**

A. Housing Element 2022 Update Highlights
B. Housing Element 2022 Update, Draft 3 Goals, Objectives, Policies and Actions
C. Revised Policy and Action Table
D. Draft Housing Needs Assessment Report
E. Draft Sites Inventory Report / Draft Sites Inventory digital copy
F. Draft Analysis of Government and Non-Government Constraints Report
G. Draft Evaluation of 2014 Housing Element Report
H. Draft General Plan Consistency Memo
I. Draft Scope of Work for Racial and Social Equity Analysis of the Housing Element 2022 Update
J. Written Comments and Responses
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2 https://www.sfhousingelement.org/node/1104